ANSWER TO MODERNISM

(AL-INTIBAHAT-UL-MUFEEDAH)

BY:
MAULANA ASHRAF ALI THANVI (RA)

Translated By:

Mohd. Hasan Askari and Karrar Husain

Revised & Annotated by:

Shamsul Huda Qasmi
&
(Prof.) Fakhrul Islam Mazahiri Alig

Favoured by:

Maulana Huzaifa Gulam Muhammad Vastanvi
(CEO, Jamia Akkalkuwa)

***Publisher**:*
The International Academy of Qasmi
Thought (IAQT), Akkalkuwa, (MS), India,
Pin- 425415

Details:

Book Name	:	Al-Intibahat-ul-Mufeedah (Answer to Modernism)
Author	:	Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi
Annotated by	:	Shamsul Huda Qasmi (Jamia) & Prof. Fakhrul Islam Mazahiri Alig
Favoured by	:	Maulana Huzaifa Gulam Muhammad Vastanvi (CEO, Jamia Akkalkuwa)
Published	:	2020 AD 1442 AH
Pages	:	143
Copies	:	1100
Price	:	…
Composed by	:	Shamsul Huda Qasmi (Jamia Akkalkuwa)
Publisher	:	The International Academy of Qasmi Thought (IAQT), Akkalkuwa, (MS), India, Pin- 425415

ADDRESSES:

Maharashtra	:	The International Academy of Qasmi Thought (IAQT), Akkalkuwa (MS), India
Deoband	:	Maktaba Zafar Ashraf, Deoband, Madniya, Naeemiyah, Zam Zam, Deeni Kitab Ghar, Faisal
Saharanpur	:	Majmaul Fiqhil Hanafi, Maktaba Imdadul Guraba, Maktaba Darus-Saadah

CONTENTS

PUBLISHER’S WORD

By Maulana Huzaifa Gulam Muhammad Vastanvi
CEO of Jamia Islamia Ishaatul Uloom, Akkalkuwa, MS, India

Allah Almighty made man the noblest of creatures and created the universe for man and man for His worship and cognition. He endowed him with abundant knowledge and ample intellect, which are the supreme blessings for man. It is through this knowledge and intellect, man is progressing, but the human intellect and knowledge are limited and its resources too are finite. Therefore, through revelation, Allah Almighty provided the perfect means of guidance. It has two benefits: One is that man is saved from arrogance and pride because he needs revelation and the second one is that facts are obtained, especially the transcendental cognition and of metaphysics.

The revelation that Allah sent to the prophets contains guidance in every aspect of human life. Because of the rich intellect, man seeks to know himself, his surroundings and his Creator. But for some reasons, it was impossible for him, therefore, his rational and practical thirst was quenched through revelation. The revelation that was descended to the Holy Prophet (sws) has universal and lasting guidance. It contains signs of all sciences, including theology; the basic and important science of Islam.

It is necessary to know logic and philosophy to understand theology, in order to acquire mastery of the principles of reason and to defend Islam. Therefore, Imam Shah Waliullah Muhaddis Dehlavi (RA) counted it in the five basic sciences of the Qur'an, around which the teachings of the Qur'an revolve. But it is unfortunate that we, the people of Madrasas, have taken the curriculum by considering logic, philosophy and theology as unnecessary and excluded it. Once again, there is a need to revive the knowledge of the principles of religion. We

have decided with the help of Hakim Fakhr-ul-Islam Sahib that we would do our best for this noble job, Insha-Allah.

For this very purpose, we laid the foundation of “Majma-ul-Fikr-il-Qasmi Adduwali”, under which the first book of Hazrat Imam Al-Nanotavi, “Hujjat-ul-Islam” has been published in an attractive style with an elaborative footnotes. People of the taste loved it. Now it is planned to publish a scholarly journal in near future and occasionally a conference would be held inviting experts interested in rational sciences. Every effort would be made to acquire mastery over the science of theology, so that a considerable number of expert scholars are trained who can fight the onslaught with determination on Islamic beliefs and teachings. I humbly request the readers to pray for the future plans!

"Majma-ul-Fikr-il-Qasmi Adduwali" has now prepared this second book which is in fact the English translation of the book “Al-Intebahat-ul-Mufeedah Anil-Ishtebahat-il-Jadeedah” by Hakim-ul-Ummah Mujaddid-e-Millat, Hazrat Thanvi (may Allah have mercy on him). Actually, during his visit to Aligarh Muslim University (AMU), he had delivered a speech where he gave reasonable answers to the doubts and objections of the modernists about Islam. After he returned to Thana Bhavan, he then compiled it, which became an important book of modern theology. We conducted classes of that book too at our Jamia (Akkalkuwa) which proved to be very useful for the students. This book of Hazrat Thanvi was translated into English by Prof. Hassan Askari which was published, titled “Answer to Modernism”. But unfortunately, due attention was not paid to it by both Urdu and English knowing people. Maulana Shamsul-Huda Sahib with the help of Hakim Fakhr-ul-Islam Sahib added footnotes to the book from the archives of Hazrat Thanvi, which is as follows:

The first intention was to publish the English translation of "Al-Intebahat-ul-Mufeedah-Anil-Ishtebahat-il-Jadeedah" from Jamia, Akkalkuwa. With the help of English version published

from Darul Uloom, Karachi, in 1976, computer typing of the book began. While typing the book, we came to know that there were many typographical errors in that version. The Typing completed, correcting those errors (for reference, typing errors along with corrections have been incorporated in the last pages of the book.

At the same time, the idea came up that this English version should also be annotated at difficult places and the text should be interpreted with the help of the archives of Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi. Similarly, references and quotations from the Qur'an and Hadith should be given where required, so that the reader can comprehend the book and learn the author's pure intent.

With this view, Maulana Shamsul-Huda (lecturer at Jamia Akkalkuwa) and Hakeem Fakhr-ul-Islam Sahib (former lecturer at Jamia Unani medical College, Akkalkuwa) started the work together and completed it with the help of various Urdu and Arabic commentaries of the book. Insha-Allah, it will prove to be helpful to understand the book and solve the difficult places in it.

Long ago, the work had been completed but could not get published for some reason. Now, Al-Hamdulillah, it got ready, and after the review of Mr. Shaukat Ali Sahib, it is going to be published soon. On this occasion, we are highly grateful to Hakim Fakhrul Islam Sahib, Maulana Shamsul Huda Sahib and Mr. Shaukat Ali Sahib for this noble cause. May Allah grant them the best reward here and in the life hereafter for this scholarly cooperation and make it beneficial for the Ummah and abundant virtues for us in the Hereafter! Ameen!

Date: 22/06/2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The book in hand is the English translation of ***"Al-Intebahaatul Mufeedah Anil-Ishtebahatil Jadeedah"***, originally authored in Urdu by Hazrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi RA (1863-1943) to remove the modern objections and scientific doubts raised by atheists and critics of Islam. At the behest of Mufti Taqi Usamani Sahib, the book was translated into English by a very famous scholar, Professor Hasan Askari sahib and got it published in Pakistan many years ago. Since, the English version is not easily available in India, Hazrat Maulana Huzaifa Gulam Muhammad Vastanvi, the chief executive of Jamia Islamia Isha'atul Uloom, Akkalkuwa, expressed his strong wish to get it published from Jamia Akkalkuwa itself to make the book commonly available in India for English knowing people. He, therefore, asked me to compose the book and give it a final touch for a fresh printing. While composing, I came across several typing errors that had crept into the book with the passage of time. For reference, a list of the mistakes has been included in the last pages of the book. Maulana again suggested me to go through the book thoroughly and correct the mistyped words in the old version published from Pakistan. He also advised me to seek opinions of Dr. Fakhrul Islam Sahib Mazahiri, the then lecturer of BUMS College of Jamia, Akkalkuwa, (now lecturer of Tibbiyah College in Deoband) to add some important footnotes to the book wherever required. Alhamdulillah, Dr. Fakhrul Islam Sahib gave his precious time and provided relevant footnotes in Urdu language which I translated them into English and placed them wherever he suggested to put them.

Here, we would like to specially thank Janab Mr Shaukat Ali Sahib (Eng) for giving his precious time to go through the whole book with utmost care. He corrected some important typing mistakes in the book and added some valuable footnotes

as well. We pray to Allah Almighty to reward him here and the hereafter! Ameen!

We would like to thank Allah Ta'ala Who alone enabled us to get this noble job done and also would express our hearty gratitude to Maulana Huzaifa Ghulam Muhammad Vastanvi Sahib for reposing his full faith in us to perform this righteous deed and helped us every way to make this book published.

Finally, we do admit that there is always scope in improving this book with better footnotes and explanations, despite all the efforts we have put in. We, therefore, request you to please intimate to us your suggestions and feedbacks to improve the future edition.

May Allah Ta'ala accept our humble efforts, forgive the mistakes and make it a source for our forgiveness in the hereafter. Ameen

Shamsul Huda Qasmi (Jamia Isha'atul Uloom, Akklkuwa)

(Dr. Prof.) Fakhrul Islam Mazahiri (Tibbiyah College, Deoband)

Date: 23/07/2020

About the Author

"Why has the Islamic world not been providing men like *Imam Ghazali* since the fall of Baghdad"? The orientalists of the west are in habit of wondering, not without a malicious glee, and, it goes without saying, not without being echoed by their Eastern admirers what they have so far failed to notice is that by the early 17th century the centre of Islamic science has shifted to South Asia which was at that time also the seat of *Mughal* Empire, one of the greatest in world history, and of what generally known as Indo-Muslim culture. It was this age which produced as great scholars and spiritual masters as *Shaikh Ahmad* of *Sarhind*, known as "*Mujaddid-e-Alf-i-Thani*", and Shaikh *Abdul Haque* of *Delhi*, to be followed by *Shah Waliullah* of *Delhi* in the 18th century, and by his sons in the early 19th century. As British imperialism tightened its grip on South Asia, the sacred task of and promoting traditional Islamic sciences, and of renewing them- which in this context can only mean, not fanciful innovation, but a restatement of the authentic orthodox position- was taken up by the world famous Darul Uloom of Deoband, under the guidance of *Maulana Muhammad Qasim Nanautawi, Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi* and *Maulana Mahmoodul Hasan,* who were not only great scholars, but also great freedom fighters and spiritual masters.

It is to this "golden chain" that Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi belongs. Born in 1863 A.D., at Thana Bhawan, a small town in the east of Delhi, he received his education at Deoband, and at that age of twenty he himself started teaching Islamic sciences at Kanpur. Very soon he became famous as a teacher and as a spiritual guide, mainly through his sermons- hundreds of which have since been appearing in a published form, bringing knowledge and illumination to the Muslims of

South Asia. But in 1897[1], he retired to his hometown, and, besides establishing a school of Islamic learning, revived the spiritual centre (*Khanqah*) founded by his own master, *Haji Imdadullah*. For full forty six years[2] till his death in 1943, he led a life totally devoted to religious instruction and spiritual guidance, and to the writing of books in Urdu, Persian and Arabic- about a thousand, large and small- among which "*Bahisti Zewar*" is a household word among the Muslims of South Asia. His favourite subjects are the exegesis of the Holy Qur'an and *Tasawwuf* (Islamic Esoterism), but he has also made a valuable contribution to Islamic jurisprudence, to the science of Hadith and to the dialectical theology (*Ilmul-Kalam*). All in all, he emerges, in the sphere of Islamic sciences and Islamic spirituality, as great renovator (*Mujaddid*) specially meant to answer the intellectual and spiritual needs of the twentieth century man.

The book has been conceived as a reply to certain Muslim "modernisers" who, under the impact of the nineteenth century "scientism" and cowed down by the physical might of western imperialism, fell a prey to all kinds of flimsy doubts and misgivings about Islamic doctrine, and clamoured for a "new" or modernists apologetics even at the cost of scarifying authenticity. The book lays down certain general and basic principles which can help one to see things for what they are. The principles are, indeed, so quintessential that they can serve as an indispensable guide to the understanding of any religious tradition, besides Islam.

---

[1] Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (ra) retired to his hometown in 1897 (Ashraf al Swaneh, Vol 1,P. 84)

[2] From 1897 to 1943)

Foreword

Praise to Allah, and Peace be on the Holy Prophet

These days one notices a number of inner perversions that have crept into the religious beliefs and consequently into the religious practice of certain Muslims, and that are daily on the increase. In view of this, people have started talking about the need of compiling a 'new' dialectical theology (*Ilmul-Kalam-al-Jadid*). In the sense of revising the basic principles of the '*Ilmul-Kalam*' as it exists, this demand itself is questionable. For, these principles are quite sufficient and comprehensive, as any scholar, by practising them, can easily judge and verify for himself with absolute certainty. In the sense of further elaborating these principles, however, this demand may be considered just and valid. But what is 'new' in this case is only that certain doubts have newly arisen. In fact, it would demonstrate the comprehensiveness of the 'old' *Ilmul-Kalam* all the more conclusively, and show that, no matter what the doubts are and in what age they arise, the same 'old' principles are more than sufficient to meet them adequately. Thus, it is essential to get rid of this misunderstanding in defining this demand which has become all too popular.

Another error is still more grave, and calls for an even more urgent correction. In making this demand, what most of the people really intend is this- the injunctions of the *Shariah* with regard to the doctrinal beliefs as well as to the religious practices, enjoying universal conformity, resting on explicit statements in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith, preserved and handed down from generation to generation, should be so modified in light of new scientific researches as to bring them in agreement with the latter, even though the validity of these researches is neither confirmed by observation nor proved incontestably by rational argument. This object is patently absurd. All the propositions which are popularly known as

'new' researches have not attained the degree of certainty; actually, most of them are merely hypothetical and conjectural. Nor are most of them really new, but have been mentioned by the ancient philosophers, and have even been discussed by our own theologians (*Mutakallimun*) as one can see for oneself by referring to the books of *Ilmul-Kalam*.

However, there is no denying the fact that some of the doubts which had ceased to be talked about are being repeated afresh, some are being presented in a new form, while there are others which are new even with regard to their content, for they are founded upon certain assumptions which can justifiably be described as 'new researches'. It is only in this sense that the set of such doubts can properly be called 'new'. And, in so far as we mean to combat these doubts which are 'new' in this sense, and also because a certain 'newness' in the mode of expression may be found useful, making it more suited to the contemporary taste, it would be permissible to describe our solution of these difficulties and our refutation of these doubts as a 'new' *Ilmul-Kalam*. If we interpret the popular demand for compiling a new *Ilmul-Kalam* in this fashion, there is no point in denying such a need.

In whatever way you may interpret this need, we own our part have for a long time been anxiously considering different forms in which this need could be fulfilled. Some of these forms were comprehensive, but also voluminous. So, our mind settled on a shorter method. Let all the doubts that are currently being expressed orally or in books be collected and catalogued, and each one of them answered individually. In this way, our answers would be more efficacious in refuting the present doubts, each one of them having been dealt with separately and particularly, and the general principles obtained in the course of discussing the particular and individual doubts should, *In-Sha-Allah*, prove adequate to refute similar and comparable doubts that may arise in future.

This procedure required that doubts should be compiled together, and the responsibility for this task does not lie only on the man who is to furnish the answers. So, we asked a number of people to help us in this respect. And we waited for a sufficient number of doubts to be compiled, so that we could begin our tasks in the name of Allah.

We were still waiting, when we had to make a journey to Bengal in the beginning of *Dhil-Qa'dah*, 1327 AH. We broke the journey at Aligarh in order to meet our younger brother who was posted as a sub-inspector there. Some students of the MAO College came to know of our arrival, and paid us a visit. A group of them informed the secretary of the college, *Nawab Vaqarul-Umara*, and probably requested him to invite us for sermon. We received a letter to this effect from the *Nawab* at night, and in the morning he himself came to see us, and took us to the college. This being a Friday, we offered our prayers there, and, as desired, gave a sermon, that continued till the time of the afternoon (*Asr*) prayers. (A brief summary of this sermon has been given in the present book by way of a preface).

From the way the students listened to the sermon we could judge that they had in a certain degree the eagerness and expectancy to find out the truth; we even saw in them the signs of understanding and discernment. They expressed the desire to be given the opportunity to listen occasionally to our discourses and sermons in future too, for the sake of their reform and edification. This being a service to religion, we were only too happy to accept the suggestion.

Seeing this, we proposed to ourselves a further concision and consequently a little modification even in the shorter plan we had contemplated. We now decided that for the present we should not wait for all individual and particular doubts to be compiled, which was a task requiring the help of

others, but should consider only those doubts which we had ourselves heard in the course of our conversation with people, or seen formulated in books, and should try to answer them as far as was necessary in our sermons before the students. Brief summaries of these sermons could then be published in book form for the benefit of those who had not been present. The oral sermon could precede the publication, or it could also be otherwise, depending on the time and the situation. Moreover, if some people would, during the course of this undertaking or before or after it, help us in compiling the doubts, then that earlier plan could also be executed, and a second part could be added to the present book. Failing that, we have our trust in the Almighty Allah, and hope that even this elementary work would be quite sufficient. If the reader can find someone to teachit systematically in detail, the benefit would be all the greater.

If Allah helps someone to compile from the writings of atheists and critics of Islam all those objections and doubts that are based on the confrontation between Islam on the one hand, and science or the new principles introduced by western civilisation on the other, and then to write a detailed refutation, such a work would genuinely deserve the name of a 'new' *Ilmul-Kalam*. In fact, a comprehensive model of such a book has, thanks to Allah, been already published, compiled from the teachings of *Hussain-al-Jasr-al-Tarabulasi* and entitled "*Al-Risalah al-Hamidiyyah*". Even an Urdu translation under the name of "Science Aur Islam" has appeared and been found useful and attractive by many readers.

والله ولي التوفيق وبيده أزمة التحقيق. اللهم يسر لنا هذا الطريق واجعل عونك لنا خير رفيق.

May Allah help us in the task and make it easy for us.

By Way of Preface

Sermon delivered at the MAO College

The text of the sermon was a verse of the Holy Qur'an from the chapter "Luqman":

واتبع سبيل من أناب إلي الخ (القران)

"And follow the way of the one who has turned himself towards Me" (31-15)

Since the sermon was rather long, we would give only a summary here:

Today we do not propose to speak on a particular theme, but to make a brief survey of the causes which have not so far allowed you to profit from the sermons of the *Ulema*, and which, if not indicated and reminded now, would render such sermons unprofitable in future too. The causes spring from certain deficiencies in yourselves.

The first of these deficiencies is that although religious doubts are spiritual ailments, yet you do not regard them as ailments. That is why you have never dealt with them in the manner you deal with physical ailments. May Allah protect you from all harms, but whenever it so happens that you fall ill, you never wait for the official physician of the college to come down to your room for himself in order to examine you and to treat you. When you were ill, you must rather have gone to his residence yourself and spoken to him about you illness, and if his treatment did you no good, you must have gone beyond the boundary of the college to the town, and seen the civil surgeon at the hospital.

And in case even his treatment did not prove effective, you must have left even the town and made a journey to other cities, and must have spent quite a good sum of money in bearing the expenses of the journey, in paying the doctors and

in buying medicines. In short, you had no peace of body or mind until you had fully regained your health. This being so, how is it that when you are affected with religious doubts, you just expect that the *Ulema* themselves should attend you? Why do you not turn to them yourselves? And if, during this quest, one *alim* fails to restore your health (either because his answer is not sufficient, or because it is not to your taste), why do you not seek other *Ulema*? Why do you jump to the conclusion that your problem is insoluble? You should at least have made a thorough search for its solutions. The expense it entails is almost nothing in comparison with what you spent on a physical cure. What could be simpler than to send a reply paid post card to any religious scholar you choose, and to ask him whatever you like?

The second deficiency is that you too often have an absolute confidence in your own opinion and judgement, and assume that nothing can be wrong with your way of thinking. This is another reason why you never turn to any religious scholar (*alim*). This in itself is a great error. If you seek a verification of your opinion from the *Ulema*, you would soon be aware of the errors you commit.

The third deficiency is that, in religious matters, you are habitually reluctant to follow anyone. That is why you do not accept the authority of any expert in any religious matters, but always try into the explanations, reasons and arguments of everything, while the truth is that one who is not an expert can not at all do without accepting the authority of an expert. This does not mean that the scholars of the *Shariah* do not possess any reasons or arguments. They do possess all that. But many things are beyond your understanding just as it is very difficult to explain the theorem of Euclid to a man who is ignorant of the first principles, definitions and other preliminaries necessary for a proper study of geometry, in the same way there are certain sciences which serve as instruments and

elementary principles for a study of the injunctions of the *Shariah.* Anyone who wishes to understand them fully must necessarily acquire knowledge of these sciences to being with. But the man, who has not the time or the inclination to do so, cannot help accepting the authority of someone else.

I would, therefore, advise you to adopt this method. Whenever you have a doubt with regard to any religious matter, you should continue to put it before different *Ulema* until it has been finally removed, and should in no case rely on your own judgement. If there is something which you are unable to understand perfectly, you had better admit your own shortcoming and then trust and follow those *Ulema* who are really experts in their own field. If you adopt this procedure, I do hope that Allah will help you, and you will soon be able to correct your errors.

Introduction

The Branches of "*Hikmah*" or Philosophy

What the Greek and Muslim philosophers call "*Hikmah*" (wisdom), or philosophy, is a general term which does not exclude any science or branch of knowledge, and the *Shariah* is also included in it. This being so, we have to discuss here as to what "*Hikmah*" or philosophy is, and how it is classified.

Philosophy is the knowledge of real entities as they are, the object of such knowledge being that the self acquires thereby some kind of excellence. Thus every science deals with the characteristics of a certain form of reality.

Now, according to a primary classification, philosophy is of two kinds, for all the entities it deals with are either such actions and deeds whose existence lies within the scope of our will and power, or such entities whose existence does not lie within the scope of our will. The knowledge which pertains to the entities of the first kind is called "Practical Philosophy" (*Al-hikmat-ul-Amaliyah*), and that which pertains to the entities of the second kind is called "Theoretical Philosophy" (*Al-Hikmat-ul-Nazariyyah*).

Then, each of these two branches of philosophy is further sub-divided into three kinds. For "practical philosophy" can either deal with the good of the individual in which case it is called "Ethics" (*Tahdhib-ul-Akhlaq*); or with the good of a group of individuals who live in the same house, in which case it is called "Domestic Economy[1]" (*Tadbir-ul-Manzil*); or with the good of a group which lives in the same town or country, in which case it is called “Politics” (*Siyasat-ul-Madaniyyah*).These are, then, the three branches of “Practical Philosophy.”

[1] Household administration

As for “Theoretical Philosophy”, it deals either with the characteristics of such entities as do not intrinsically need any substance for their physical or ideal existence, in which case it is called “Metaphysics” (*Ilahiyyat*); or it deals with the characteristics of such entities as need a substance for their physical existence but not for their ideal existence in which case it is called “Mathematics” (*Riadhi*); or it deals with the characteristics of such entities as need a substance both for physical and ideal existence, in which case it is called “Physics” (*Ilm-al-tabi’ah*). These are, then, the three branches of “Theoretical Philosophy”.

Thus we obtain these six branches of “Wisdom” of philosophy- namely, Ethics, Domestic Economy Politics, Metaphysics, Mathematics, and Physics. Although there are many more subdivisions, yet the principal classification of philosophy is confined only to these.

Now, we must understand that the real object of the *Shariah* is to discipline human beings in such a way that they may make the fulfilment of their obligations to the Creator as well as of their obligations to the creatures, the means of gaining the pleasure of Allah. In fact, the injunctions of the *Shariah* with regard to these two duties yield the good of worldly life as well, and when they seem to go against worldly good it always turns out that public good has been given precedence over individual good, or that the situations entailed a spiritual harm greater than worldly good, which has been eliminated. All the same, the real object of the *Shariah* is the quest for the pleasure of Allah.

On the other hand, mathematics and physics have nothing to do with the duty of fulfilling one’s obligations to God or to creatures. So, the *Shariah* has not dealt with these subjects as its proper object. If some topic of physics etc. has now and then been touched upon by the *Shariah*, it is only by way of an auxiliary instrument and as a proof of some argument in metaphysics, which, as we shall soon show, is one of the objects of the *Shariah*. It is borne out by the fact that the

physical phenomena have been referred to in the Holy Qur'an as:

لأيات لأولى الألباب (القران)

“Signs for the people of wisdom’’ (3:190)

Thus, we are left with only one branch of Theoretical Philosophy- that is to say, metaphysics- and with all the three branches of practical philosophy. Since all of them are involved in the attainment of the aim mentioned above-that is, fulfilment of the two kinds of obligations-, the *Shariah* has dealt with them fully. As for the perfect way in which the problems of Practical Philosophy have been expounded, even the followers of the Greek philosophers have had to admit that “the Islamic *Shariah* has fulfilled this need in the most perfect manner and with all possible details.”

And, in the case of the problems of metaphysics too, a comparative study of the arguments on the two sides- Greek philosophy and Islamic Shariah- obliges the philosophers to make the same admissions.

Thus, the first subject of discussion which properly comes within scope of the *Shariah* is metaphysics *(‘Ilmul-ilahiyyat*), one subdivision of which is the “science of doctrines and beliefs” (*Ilmul-aqaid*), dealing with topics like revelation (*Wahy*), Prophet-hood (*Nubuwwah*) and Life after Death and the Day of Judgment (*Ma'ad*). The second subject of discussion is Practical Philosophy which has been subdivided by the *Shariah* into (a) the injunctions with regard to the relation between man and God-‘Ibadat; (b) the injunctions with regard to the relations between one man and another- *Mu’amalat*; (c) the injunctions with regard to the relations between man and society- *Mu’asharah*[1]; and (d) the injunctions with regard to the relation between a man and himself- *Akhlaq*. (And these divisions are not different from that of *Tahdhib-e-Akhlaq, Tadbeer-e-Mazil and Siyasat-e-*

[1] In translation, *Mu'asharat* has been mentioned before *Mu'amalat*, here, the order is changed according to the original Urdu text.

Madaniyyah but are interrelated with each other and can be understood with little consideration.[1])

In short, the sciences which properly belong to the *Shariah* are five- the four which we have just mentioned, and the science of doctrines and beliefs. We do not propose to deal with all these five elements, but with only those things about which people with a western education have sometimes come to feel a doubt. Since these doubts are related to belief. The purpose of all our discussions would, in this sense, be to deal with only one element-namely, doctrines and beliefs. Although the proper order would have been to take up for discussion all the problems pertaining only to one of these divisions before turning to the problems of another kind, yet for the sake of making the discussion more attractive and delightful to the readers, it was found more suitable to treat all kinds of problems in a composite way. So, all that we have to say will, with the help of Allah, be presented in this form in the subsequent pages.

For this book we have chosen the title “Intimations" (*Intibahat*). These very intimations, in fact, form the main object of this book. Before dealing with the chief topics, we shall explain certain fundamental rules, which stand as First Principles in relation to the topics of discussion. While discussing the main topics, we shall have occasion to refer to these rules from time to time, so that one can easily understand and accept what is being said. May the Almighty Allah help us!

Ashraf Ali
Thana Bhavan,
Muzaffar Nagar,
UP, India

[1] The translation in brackets is added as per the original text book.

FIRST PRINCIPLES

Principle No. (1)

"One’s inability to understand something is no argument for its being false."

Explanation:

When we describe a thing as “false", we really mean to say that a clear and definite argument leads us to conclude that it does not exist. It is evident enough that these two facts- namely, the inability to understand that a certain thing exists, and the certain knowledge that it does not exist- are totally different from each other. The former (that is, the inability to understand that something exist) signifies that, for lack of observation, our mind has not been able to comprehend the causes and modes of its existence, and hence feels bewildered, and hesitates in determining these causes and modes. But, in this case, beyond wondering how such a thing could exist, our mind can produce no sound argument, rational or based on report, to establish its nonexistence. On the other hand, the latter (that is, the knowledge that the thing does not exist) signifies that our mind can produce a sound argument rational or based on report, to establish its nonexistence. For example, a rustic who has never chanced to see a railway train, comes to hear that there is a carriage which runs all by itself without being pulled by a beast. He would naturally be bewildered, and wonder as to how it could be so. But, at the same time, he would be unable to produce an argument to deny this fact, for he does not possess any argument even to prove that the fast and continued motion of a carriage can have no other cause than being pulled by a beast. This is what we call “the inability to understand.” If the rustic begins to deny the fact only on this ground and to refute the reporter, all sensible people would consider him a fool, and the basis of their judgment would be the elementary principle that if a man is unable to understand a

certain thing, he is not necessarily entitled to deny its existence. This, then, is an illustration of "the inability to understand" the existence of a thing.

Now, if a man boards a train at Kolkata, and get down at Delhi, and a second man comes and states in his presence that the train has today covered the journey between Kolkata and Delhi in one hour, the traveller would refute him. And we would possess an argument for this refutation- the argument being his own observation and the witness of one or two hundred other observers who have come by the same train. This is an illustration of proving the non-existence of a thing.

In the same way, let us suppose that a man is told that on the day of judgement one will have to cross the bridge called "*Sirat*" which will be finer than a hair. Since no one has ever seen such a thing happen, it is natural enough that the man should wonder as to how it could be so. But it is also evident that his reason does not possess any argument to refute the statement. For, if there is an argument at all, it can apparently be only this- the human foot is so broad and the place where it is to be put is so narrow, hence it is not possible for the foot to rest on it and to walk on it. But one cannot even prove that it is rationally necessary that the breadth of path must be greater than that of the foot. Of course, we may concede that this is the habitual fact according to our observation, that we have not seen anything contrary to it, and if we have at all seen the contrary (for example, people walking on a rope), we have not found such a great difference of breadth. But is it really impossible that Allah, Who is omnipotent, may altogether change this natural or habitual law in the other world? The man, who denies this possibility on the basis of what has habitually been observed, would be placing himself in the position of the rustic who had denied that a railway train would run by itself without being pulled by a beast.

Now, take a different kind of example, if a man were to hear someone declares that on the day of judgment, Allah the majestic would honour and exalt the offspring of a certain saint on account of their relationship to him, even without their being genuine Muslims, then such a belief would be repudiated and considered false, for there is a solid argument which proves just the opposite of this belief. The argument is this case being the clear teachings of the *Shariah* that an infidel cannot attain salvation.

This then, is the distinction between what one has not been able to understand and what is "false".

Principle No. (2)

"If a thing is rationally possible, and its existence is attested by sound report, then it is necessary to accept its existence. On the other hand if its non-existence is attested by sound report, then it is equally necessary to accept its non-existence."

Explanation: Facts are of three kinds:-

Firstly, those the existence of which is shown to be necessary by reason. For example, let us take the statement "one is half of two". This is a fact which must exist so necessarily that, having understood the meaning of one and two, reason must consider its opposite to be false. Such a fact is called "Necessary" (*Wajib*).

Secondly, those the non-existence of which is shown to be necessary by reason. For example, let us take the statement "one is equal to two". It is so necessary to deny this fact that reason must certainly consider it to be false. Such a fact is called "Impossible"(*Muhal*).

Thirdly, those the existence of which is neither affirmed nor denied as of necessity by reason, in such a case, reason considers their existence and non-existence both as equally probable, and in order to arrive at a final judgment, must examine an argument based on report. For example, the statement that "the area of such a town is greater than that of the other town" is a fact in case of which reason must either make a direct examination or accept the findings of those who have made such an examination. Until it adopts either of these two courses, reason cannot regard the statement as necessarily true or necessarily false, but must admit an equal probability of its being true or false. Such a fact is called "Possible" (*Mumkin*).

Therefore, in dealing with a fact which is "possible" if we can find an argument based on sound report to prove that it is true, then it becomes necessary to believe that it does exist and is real. But if the same kind of argument can be found to prove its non-existence, then it is necessary to believe that it does not exist. For example, in the instance of the comparative areas of two towns, we would, on examination, judge the statement in some cases to be true and in other case to be false.

Similarly, it is rationally possible for the Heavens to exist as the Muslims in general believe them to do. That is to say, reason does not possess any argument either to confirm or to deny this fact, but admits both the probabilities. So, in order to decide whether such a thing dose exist or not, reason has to depend on an argument based on report. And such an argument based on sound report is provided by the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith, declaring that such a thing dose exist. So, reason must, as of necessity, affirm the existence of the Heavens.

If someone were to consider the Pythagorean system to be an argument based on report, proving that the Heavens do not exist, then such an opinion would only show his ignorance or lack of understanding. For, the only valid inference that you can draw from it is that the correctness of the calculations according to that system, does not depend on the existence or the motion of the Heavens. So, if an actual fact does not depend for its existence on another fact, its existence does not prove that the latter does not exist. For example, if an actual work does not depend on a certain government official to be performed, how can the presence of this work alone prove that the official is not present in the town? At the most, one can only say that this fact does not prove his presence either. But one can find other arguments (based on sound report) proving that officer was present.

Principle No. (3)

"What is rationally impossible is something totally different from what is merely improbable. The impossible is opposed to reason itself, while the improbable is opposed merely to habit. The predicates of reason and those of habit are quite distinct, and it is erroneous to identify them with each other. What is impossible can never exist, but what is merely improbable may exist. It is the impossible alone which can be described as irrational, while the improbable is only something which reason cannot understand by itself. It is a great error to confuse the one with the other."

Explanation: The impossible is that, the non-existence of which is shown by reason to be necessary (as we have explained with an example under Principle No.2[1]). And the improbable is the existence of which is allowed by reason, but since no one has ever seen it to exist nor heard of it from a sufficient number of observers when one comes to hear of its existence, one is at first astonished and perplexed (as we have explained with an example under Principle No.1[2], while discussing the "inability to understand"). The necessary deductions which follow from these two are quite distinct. It is necessary to reject the impossible outright merely on the ground of its being impossible, while it is not even permissible to reject and deny the improbable merely on the ground of its being improbable. Of course, if there are, besides improbability, other arguments for its rejection, then it is not only permissible, but even necessary to reject it.

---

[1] Principle no 2 is- "if a thing is rationally possible, and its existence is attested by sound report, then it is necessary to accept its existence. On the other hand if its non-existence is attested by sound report, then it is equally necessary to accept its non-existence."

[2] Principle no 1 is- "One’s inability to understand something is no argument for its being false."

As we have seen in the first and the second illustrations given under Principle No. 1[2] and No. 2[1], if someone were to say that "one is equal to two". It is necessary to reject this statement, but if one were to say that "a railway train runs without being pulled by a beast", it is not permissible to reject this statement, even though such a thing should be improbable and astonishing for a man who has so far, in the habitual course of things, only seen carriages being pulled by beasts. In fact, all those things which are not supposed to be astonishing are all in reality very astonishing, but since we have repeatedly observed them to be like this and have grown used to them, this familiarity does not allow us to pay any attention to their being really so astonishing, while in actual fact they are probable and improbable in equal degree.

Let us take two examples– on the one hand, the railway train running as it does, and, on other, the male seed entering the womb and becoming there a human and living form. Is there any essential difference between the two cases from present point of view? Essentially, the second case is the more astonishing fact. But the rustic who has never seen the first case but has repeatedly been observing the second since his childhood, would consider the former to be very astonishing, and would not consider the latter to be at all astonishing, though it is much more so.

Similarly, the man who has become habituated to see a gramophone speak but has never seen human hands and feet doing so, does not consider such an action on the part of the gramophone to be at all astonishing, but feels astonished when he hears of the same action emanating from hands and feet. It would not matter very much if he finds it only astonishing, but the great and regrettable error is that he should consider what is merely astonishing to be impossible as well, and taking it for granted that such a thing is impossible, should go to the extent

of denying a clear statement in the Holy Qur'an and Hadith, or should proceed to make unnecessary and false interpretations.

In short, it is a great error to treat a certain fact as impossible merely on the ground of its being improbable. Of course, if, besides improbability, one can find some other valid argument also to prove that such a thing does not exist, then it becomes necessary to negate it, as we have already said under Principle No.1[1], in presenting the example of the train which was supposed to have covered the distance between Kolkata and Delhi in an hour. On the other hand, if one can find a valid argument to prove its existence but cannot find an argument having the same degree of validity to prove its non-existence, then it would be necessary to affirm its existence. For example, in those days when wireless telegraphy had not yet come into vogue and people had not generally heard of it, if someone had reported that he had seen such a thing for himself, and if we did not already possess a proof of his being truthful, in that case there could be some apparent, though not real, ground for rejecting his statement as false. But if we did possess a sure and certain proof of his being truthful, there could be no ground what so ever for rejecting his report.

These, then, are the different predicates of what is impossible and what is merely improbable. On this basis we must say that as the passage of people over the bridge of "*Sirat*" is not impossible but only improbable, and as a truthful reporter (namely, the Holy Prophet- peace be on him) has reported to us that this fact is real and does actually exist, it would be a great rational error to deny and reject the report about this passage over the bridge. Similarly, it is a vain and senseless effort to try to interpret it away.

---

[1] Principle no 1 is- "One's inability to understand something is no argument for its being false."

Principle No. (4)

"If a thing exists, it is not necessary that it must also be sensible and visible."

Explanation:

There are three ways in which one can justifiably predicate of a fact that it is true:-

(1) On the basis of personal observation–for example, we ourselves see Zaid coming.

(2) On the basis of a report from a truthful reporter- for example, some trustworthy man reports to us that Zaid has come. But our acceptance of such a report will depend on the condition that we cannot find a stronger argument to refute the report. For example, someone reports to a man that Zaid came last night, and wounded the listener with a sword. But the listener knows that he has not been wounded by anyone, nor is he wounded at the present moment. In this case, personal observation is there to refute the report. So, we would conclude that the report is not true, and that the alleged fact is not real.

(3) On the basis of a rational argument-for example, although one has not seen the sun rising nor has anyone made such a report, yet merely by seeing the sunlight one's reason at once recognizes that the sun has already risen, for one knows that the existence of sunlight depends on the rising of the sun.

Among these three facts which we have just examined existence is common to all, but only one of them is perceptible by the senses, while the other two are not. This goes to prove that when we say that a certain fact does exist, it is not necessary that it should also be perceptible by the senses. Nor is it necessary that a fact which is not perceptible by the senses should, on that ground alone, be considered as non-existent.

For example, explicit and clear verses[1] of the Holy Qur'an[2] have reported to us that there are above us seven great bodies which are called the Heavens. Now, if we cannot see them because of this visible blue tent above our heads, it is not rationally necessary that, merely on the ground of their not being perceptible by the sense, we should negate their existence. On the contrary, it is possible that they do exist, and since a truthful reporter (namely, the Holy Qur'an[3]) has given us a report about them, it is rationally necessary to affirm their existence, as we have already shown under Principle No. 2[4].

---

[1] Statements

[2] and the Hadith

[3] and the Hadith

[4] Principle no 2 is- "if a thing is rationally possible, and its existence is attested by sound report, then it is necessary to accept its existence. On the other hand, if its non-existence is attested by sound report, then it is equally necessary to accept its non-existence."

Principle No. (5)

"It is not possible to prove a purely reported fact by a purely rational argument. So it is not also permissible to demand such an argument."

Explanation:

Under Principle No. 4[1], we have shown that among the different kinds of facts there is one, the existence of which is made known to us only by the report of a truthful reporter, the term “pure report” refers to such facts. It is evident enough that one cannot argue about such facts on the basis of a purely rational argument, as is possible in the case of the third kind of facts (discussed under Principle No. 4[1]).

For example, someone tells us that Alexander and Darius were two kings who went into battle against each other. Now, if another person were to demand a rational argument in order to establish this fact, even the greatest philosopher would not be able to present any other argument except this–the existence of two such kings and a war between them is not impossible, but possible enough, and trustworthy historians have reported that this possibility did actually come into existence, and since it is rationally necessary to affirm a fact as real when we learn from a truthful reporter that what was possible did really come into existence (as we have shown under Principle No. 3[2]), we must necessarily accept the report about the two kings as an actual fact.

Similar is the case of the coming of the Day of Judgement, the resurrection of the dead, and the beginning of a new life. All these facts are pure reports, and even their

[1]Principle no 4 is- "if a thing exists, it is not necessary that it must also be sensible and visible."

[2] Principle no 3 is- "what is rationally impossible is something totally different from what is merely improbable. The impossible is opposed to reason itself, while the improbable is opposed merely to habit."

characteristics in detail are vouched by pure reports. So, if a man affirms these facts, no one can justifiably demand a purely rational argument from him. It would be quite sufficient for him to say in order to silence all objections-there is no argument to prove that these facts are rationally impossible, even though one may not understand them, but as these two things are not identical (as explained under Principle No. 1[1]), these facts are rational possible, and moreover, as a reporter whose truthfulness is well established on just grounds, has reported to us that this possibility shall actually come into existence, therefore we must, according to Principle No.2[2], necessarily affirm the existence and actuality of these facts. This reply, then, would be quite sufficient on the part of the man who affirms them. If he proceeds to provide a purely rational argument as well in support of his affirmation, his only intention would be to do away with the dubiety arising from improbability, and to remove the perplexity of his listeners. But the man who is arguing for this case would not owe this further explanation to his listeners- it would be an act of generosity on his part, and a mere concession, if he provides it.

---

[1]Principle no 1 is- "one's inability to understand something is no argument for its being false."

[2] Principle no 2 is- "if a thing is rationally possible, and its existence is attested by sound report, then it is necessary to accept its existence. On the other hand if its non-existence is attested by sound report, then it is equally necessary to accept its non-existence."

Principle No. (6)

"There is some difference between a precedent and an argument. It may be justifiable to demand an argument from the man who makes an assertion, but it is not valid to demand a precedent from him."

Explanation:

Let us suppose that a man asserts that King George V held his coronation at Delhi. Now another man comes and says, "We shall accept this statement as true only when you cite a precedent to show that an English king has done it before, but if you fail to provide such a precedent, we shall consider the event to be unreal." Would it, in this case, be obligatory for the man who makes the assertion to cite a precedent, or would it not be quite sufficient for him to say, "We do not possess any precedent for this event, but we do have a sound argument, since we have heard about it from people who observed it for themselves. But if he can cite no observer, it would be sufficient to say that it has been published in the newspapers." Once this argument has been presented, would it really be necessary to wait for a precedent in order to accept the event as real?

Similarly, if a man asserts that human hands and feel will speak on the Day of Judgment, no one can have the right to demand a precedent from him, nor can anyone justifiably refute him merely on the ground that he has failed to cite a precedent. Of course, it is obligatory for him to put forward an argument in support of his contention. But since his contention can be established only on the basis of a pure report, it would be more than sufficient for him to argue as follows, according to Principle No. 5[1]:- since there is no rational argument to

---

[1] Principle no 5 is- "it is not possible to prove a purely reported fact by a purely rational argument. So it is not also permissible to demand such an argument."

prove that this fact is impossible, and a truthful reporter has reported to us that it will actually happen, so it is rationally necessary to affirm its existence and its actuality. However, if he provides a precedent as well, it will be a concession on his part, and an act of generosity. For instance, he may cite the gramophone as a precedent to show that even a lifeless object can produce sound and words. What a pity that today people with a western (modern) education demand a precedent for everything that has been reported by the Holy Quran and the Hadith! They should try to understand that this is a case of considering what is unnecessary as necessary.

Principle No. (7)

"Only four situations are rationally possible in which there can be a contradiction between a rational argument and argument based on report:-

1. **Both the arguments should be final and conclusive. Such a situation cannot exist, as it is impossible for two truths to contradict each other.**
2. **Both should be approximative. Although in this situation there is room for reconciling the two arguments by turning them away from the literal sense and giving them some other interpretation, yet, according to the regular rule of human language that the basic sense in all words is the literal and apparent one, we would take the report in its literal sense, and would not consider the connotation of the rational argument as valid.**
3. **The argument based on report should be final, while the rational argument should be approximative. Here the report would certainly be given precedence over the other argument.**
4. **The rational argument should be final, while the argument based on report should be approximative, either in respect of its connotation or in respect of its authenticity. Here the rational argument would be given precedence, and the report would be interpreted in a non-literal sense."**

   Thus the last situation is the only one in which reason (*dirayah*) is to be given precedence over tradition[1] (*riwayah*). And it is not justifiable to adopt this procedure in all possible situations.

Explanation:

[1]Revelation

It is self-evident what a "rational argument" is, while an "argument based on report" is the information provided by a truthful reporter, as has been explained under Principle No.4[1]. As for a "contradiction", it is the opposition of two statements in such a manner that if we accept one of them to be true, we must necessarily consider the other to be false. For example, a man reports that Zaid took a train for Delhi at 10 a.m. this day. Now, another man reports that Zaid was sitting with him in his house at 11 a.m. the same day. The opposition of these two statements would be called a "contradiction."

Since, in the case of a contradiction, it is necessary for one of the two statements to be false so that the other may be true, two valid arguments can never enter into such a contradiction. When two arguments contradict each other, the problem would be solved like this. If both are equally valid, we shall turn one of them away from its literal sense, and by giving it a secondary interpretation accept it, and we shall accept the other as well in retaining its literal sense, thus reconciling the two arguments. On the other hand, if one of the arguments is valid while the other is not, we shall accept the former and reject the letter. For example, in the case cited above, if one of the reporters is trustworthy and the either is not, we shall accept the report of the one who is trustworthy and reject that of the other who is untrustworthy. If both of them are equally trustworthy, we shall judge the matter in the light of other indications, and thus accept one of the reports literally, and give some kind of a secondary interpretation to the second in order to reconcile the two. For example, if we come to know for certain on the basis of other kinds of evidence too that Zaid did not go to Delhi at all, we shall assume that the second reporter had made a wrong surmise about Zaid's departure, or that Zaid left for the station and then

---

[1]Principle no 4 is- "if a thing exists, it is not necessary that it must also be sensible and visible."

came back without boarding the train, but the second reporter had no information of his return, or something else like this.

Having learnt this rule we should now consider that sometimes there is an apparent contradiction between a rational argument and an argument based on report. In such a case, we shall, according to this rule, have to judge whether (a) both the arguments are certain and final; or (b) both are approximative; or (c) the argument based on report is final, while the rational one is approximative; or (d) the rational argument is final, while the argument based on report is approximative, either in respect of its authenticity or in respect of its connotation. (That is to say, an argument based on report can be approximative in two respects. Firstly, it may be approximative in respect of its authenticity. For example, a tradition[1] of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) which has not been widely and consecutively reported. Secondly, it may be approximative in respect of its connotation. For example, a certain verse of the Holy Qur'an which is certainly and finally authentic, but yields two connotations, neither of which is conclusive.) These, then, are the four situations in which a contradiction can arise.

As for (a), where both the arguments are final in respect of authenticity as well as in respect of connotation, and yet contradict each other, such a situation cannot possibly exist. For, when the two are certainly true, how can truths contradict each other? If they do, it is not possible for them to be equally true. Let a man try for all he is worth, he can never produce a single instance of such a situation.

As for (b), there are sound arguments that make it necessary to accept an argument based on report which approximates to being true, as one can see by referring to the books on the fundamental principles of the *Shariah* and on ‘*Ilm-ulKalam'*. On the other hand, there is no sound argument

[1] Hadith

to make it necessary to accept a rational argument which approximates to being true. So, in this situation, we shall give precedence to the argument based on report, and shall consider the rational argument to be erroneous. Indeed, the very fact of its being approximative in itself indicates the possibility of being erroneous. So, in holding it to be erroneous, we shall not be going against requirements of reason. Although, in this situation, one way of accepting the argument based on report could also be to turn it away from its literal sense in order to reconcile it with the rational argument, yet, unnecessary indulgence in secondary interpretations being forbidden and there being no real need for it here, the *Shariah* prohibits the adoption of this procedure as being an "innovations", and it is not commendable even rationally, as we have just explained[1].

As for (c), it must be dealt, with all the more like situation (b), because when an argument based on report is, in spite of being approximative, to receive precedence over an approximative rational argument, a final argument based on report is all the more worthy of receiving precedence over an approximative rational argument.

As for (d), we cannot reject the rational argument, for it is final in its validity, but we can no more reject the argument based on report also, for sound arguments make it necessary to accept it--- as we have shown while discussing situation (b). So in this situation, we shall give the approximative argument based on report a secondary interpretation, and accept it only by bringing it into consonance with the rational argument. This is the only specific situation which justifies the contention that Reason (*Diraya*) is to be given precedence over Tradition (*Riwayah*). But it is not permissible to make such an assertion

[1] With the words," Indeed, the very fact of its being approximative in itself indicates the possibility of being erroneous. So, in holding it to be erroneous, we shall not be going against requirements of reason.

or to act upon it in situation (b[1]) and (c[2]) as we have already proved in detail.

Of course, a fifth and a sixth situation can also arise that is, the argument based on report should be approximative while the rational argument should be hypothetical and fanciful, or the former should be final while the latter should again be hypothetical. But it goes without saying that in both the situations the argument based on report will be given precedence, and the rational argument will be rejected. For, when a rational argument, in spite of its approximating to being true, is given a secondary position and rejected, a hypothetical and fanciful argument deserves this treatment all the more. A precedent for this has been cited while situation (c) was being discussed[3].

This, then, is the detailed account of the situations in which a contradiction may rise between rational arguments and arguments based on report. It clearly exposes the error of those who give an absolutely principal position to a rational argument and only a subordinate one to an argument based on report, even if the former is not approximative but only hypothetical, and the latter is final.

We shall give illustrations only for situations (b) and (d). For, situation (a) cannot possibly exist, while (c) is all the more to be treated like (d) as we have shown above. So, the two illustrations would be quite sufficient.

---

[1]Both the arguments are approximative

[2]The argument based on report is final, while the rational one is approximative

[3] Literal sense is primarily interpreted in speech according to the rule of language. Therefore, if there is a rational argument against an argument based on report, the argument based on report is regarded as a proof and the rational one is rejected. When a rational argument is treated so, and not given precedence, let alone the hypothetical and imaginative ones.

Here is an illustration for (b). The Holy Qur'an says:

قوله تعالى: وهو الذي خلق الليل و النهار و الشمس والقمر كل في فلك يسبحون (القرآن)

"And He is the One who has created the night and the day, and the sun and the moon, each floating in an orbit". (21:33)

The explicit sense of verse establishes the fact the sun moves from one position to another. On the other hand, certain scientists believe that the sun only rotates on its axis. But there is no final rational argument to establish this contention. So, it will be rationally necessary to reject this opinion, and to affirm that the sun moves from one position to another (translational motion).

Now, an illustration for (d), conclusive and final rational arguments have established the fact that the sun is disjunct from the earth, and never touches it in any position of its motion. Now, the Qur'an says:

وجدها تغرب في عين حمئة (القرآن)

"He found it setting into a miry spring". (18:86)

The apparent sense of these words may lead one un-reflectively to surmise that the sun always sets in a muddy spring. But this apparent sense would, on reflection, seem to arise from what a man may imagine at first sight. So, this verse will be interpreted to mean that *Dhul Qarnain*, looking at the sun, thought as it was setting in a muddy spring, just as to the people, travelling on the sea; it seems as if the sun were setting in the sea. Allah alone knows best!

Intimation (1)

REGARDING THE TEMPORALITY OF MATTER

(There are two grave errors with regards to the doctrine of the unity of God:

1. **Associating the exclusive attribute, eternity of God, with matter**
2. **Negating the attribute of absolute power of God)**

(Eternity, the exclusive attribute of God, is discussed in first Intimation and the second error, negating the attribute of absolute power of God, in the second Intimation)

By putting their faith in western (modern) science and following its lead blindly, many Muslims have fallen into two grave errors with regard to the doctrine of the unity of God which is the very basis of Islam. In committing these errors, such blind followers of science are being fully faithful neither to science nor to Islam, as we mean to show presently.

The first of these errors is that they thus associate another thing with Allah, the Exalted, in the quality of being eternal which is peculiar to Him alone; that is to say, they believe matter as well to be eternal. The Greek philosophers too have been guilty of this error. But they, at least, had some kinds of argument, however, flimsy and dependent upon a sophistical use of words (this argument has been thoroughly examined and exposed in the books of Muslim philosophers like the "*Hidayat-ul-Hikmah*". And we ourselves have shown its falsity in "*Dirayatul-Ismah*"[1].

---

[1] In the second part of Dirayatul-Ismah, replies to the issues of old philosophy contradicting Islam, are given. The author, M. Ashraf Ali Thanvi, divides Dirayatul-Ismah in three units. First one deals with old philosophy, the second one is about science and the third one (on P. 41) (from P. 40) deals with criticism on the issues of Astronomy contradicting Islamic Shariah. The book was written in Arabic and is worth-reading.

On the other hand, modern scientists and their followers do not possess an argument which could pretend to even that much degree of validity. As in the case of their other assertions, they have pronounced a judgment which is no more than a presumption. In other words, they have started with the assumption that if all the existents were at one time in state of pure non-existence, one cannot understand how they could come into existence out of pure nothingness. But one should reflect carefully over the problem, and ask oneself if the inability to understand a thing can serve as a valid argument for its being false. As for that, one cannot understand either how the existence of a thing, namely, matter, should not itself be preceded by non-existence, when all the modes of its existence, or, in other words, each one the material changes that it undergoes, is preceded by non-existence. What after all, is the difference between the existence of a thing (which is matter) and the succeeding modes of existence (to which it is subject)?

Thus, if the inability to understand is a valid objection, it applies to the eternity of matter and to the non-eternity of matter equally, while there is something argument more to the eternity of matter- there is a substantial argument in refutation of it. This argument very easily disposes of the contention of modern science; with a little adaptation, it can avail against the Greek science as well.

Conclusive Argument to Nullify the Eternity of Matter versus Science

Let us explain what we mean. Modern science believes that primeval matter was for a long time devoid of any substantial form (*as-suratul-jismiyyah*). Now, it is an established fact that it is impossible for matter to be abstracted from form, because matter signifies a potential existence, while that which gives it an actual existence is form. And it is evident that potential existence means no more than the ability to exist.

Therefore, the statement that matter exists without form is a contradiction in terms, and amounts to saying that two contraries can come together, and that something exists in act and at the same time does not exist in act. The logical conclusion of this line of reasoning is that matter, far from being eternal, should not exist at all.[1]

Conclusive Argument to Nullify the Eternity of Matter versus Old philosophy

If we now turn to the ancient Greek philosophy, and adopting its points of view, assume that matter has some kind of form, we shall find that, evidently enough, no substantial form (*as-suratuljismiyyah*) can exist without a generic form (*as-suratun-nau'iyyah*), and no generic form can exist without a specific form (*as-suratush-shaksiyyah*). So, when we posit some kind of a form in matter, we shall necessarily be positing a specific form as well in it. But the specific form keeps on changing, therefore, when matter acquires a second specific form after the first, the situation cannot but involve either of these two states- the previous specific form would either remain there, or perish. If it remains, a new problem would arise. The individuality of an entity lies in its specific form. If there exist two specific forms in one entity, it means that there are two entities, not one. Thus, it becomes necessary that one individual, entity is at the same time two separate entities. And this is obviously impossible. On the other hand, if the previous specific form does perish altogether, then it cannot have been eternal, for it is impossible for the eternal to perish. Therefore, it must have been temporal. And the same argument demonstrates that the specific form which existed before this one was also temporal.

---

[1] The existence of matter with substantial form was accepted in old philosophy to avoid the same flaw and the reply is given in the next paragraph.

Therefore, when each one of the specific forms turns out to be temporal, the specific form itself must be temporal. And if the specific form is non-existent, the generic form too must be non-existent; and if the generic form is non-existent, the substantial form too must be non-existent. And finally, when the substantial form is non-existent, matter itself must be non-existent. Consequently, the belief in the eternity of matter is false.

Now, as for the inability to understand how something can come into existence out of nothingness, we shall simply point out that such an occurrence should be called improbable, and not impossible. And the improbable is not something that is incapable of coming into existence. Confusing the improbable with the impossible leads to many errors.[1]

Belief in Eternity of Matter is Opposed to Both Islam and Science

This demonstration has made it clear that the belief in the eternity of matter is repugnant to Islam. And those Muslims, who follow the lead of the scientists in this matter, go against modern science too, because the scientists do not believe in God Himself. That is why we had remarked that such Muslims are true neither to Islam nor to Science.

And if you ponder rightly, it is evident that so long as one believes in the eternity of matter, there is no need or necessity for him to believe in the Creator at all. For, when matter is in itself the very cause its own existence, it means that matter is a necessary being. And it is quite irrational to posit that one necessary being can be in need of another necessary being. The kind of relationship that exists between God and

[1] See Principle no. 3 (What is rationally impossible is something totally different from what is merely improbable. The impossible is opposed to reason itself, while the improbable is opposed merely to habit.)

His attributes and acts, can, on this ground, be equally supposed to exist between matter and its attributes like motion and heat, its operations, diversities etc. etc. Thus, the very belief in the existence of God necessarily postulates the temporality of matter.

If a distinction is made between the eternal-in-itself (that is, God) and the eternal-in-time (that is, matter), then such arguments advanced by certain Greek philosophers have been decisively refuted in our old '*Ilm-ulKalam*''. Since the philosophers of the present day do not seem to uphold this argument, we shall pass by this objection.

Reply to the fallacy of Democritus

Again, one may maintain the eternity of the parts of matter in conjunction with form, and also maintain the coexistence of that form with all subsequent forms by asserting that the final constituents of matter are the atoms which can admit of a rational and conjectural division but are physically indivisible (e.g., the affirmation of the atoms on the part of Democritus). Or one may maintain that primeval matter (or substance) was initially a unified whole, containing form within itself, but was divisible, and later on split into component parts. We would like to know whether these particles or component parts, being eternal as posited, were at that stage in motion or at rest. If they were in motion, their motion too was eternal; if they were at rest, their rest was equally eternal. But at the present stage we see certain bodies in motion, and this motion is shared by every particle of component part of the body. This fact negates the eternity of rest. In the same way, we find certain other bodies at rest, which negates the eternity of motion. In short, we do observe motion and rest both, and we see both of them perishing. But it is impossible for the eternal to perish. Hence, neither the motion of these constituent parts nor their rest can possibly be

eternal. Since these parts cannot be devoid of either of the two states, it goes to prove finally that they themselves are not eternal.[1]

Now, let us turn to the objection that if matter is taken to be temporal, one cannot understand how God could have drawn it being out of nothingness. To begin with, this mode of creation is not impossible but merely improbable, and the objection is an attempt to argue about what one has never observed on the basis of what one has observed. Moreover, it is equally difficult to understand how a changeable thing should also be eternal. Thus, the inability to understand is common to both the cases. Therefore, this objection is not valid as an argument.

In short, it becomes crystal clear that the eternity of matter is absolutely impossible and false.

Even if we set aside all the arguments we have advanced, and do not consider the eternity of matter to be impossible, we are still unable to find an argument which could establish the eternity of matter as something real. It means that eternity and non-eternity both may be equally probable, and that it would be rationally possible to maintain either of the two positions. But, in a situation like this where both the alternatives are equally admissible, if a truthful reporter asserts one of them, it becomes rationally necessary to accept it. And in this debate about the nature of matter, Allah Himself and the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) have declared which alternative to choose–namely, the temporality of matter.

بَدِیْعُ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَ الْاَرْضِ (القرآن)

---

[1] Here, additional text is found in the text of Al-Intebahatul-Mufeedah with Hallul-Intebahat, which is as follows: "The substances which are supposed to be eternal in motion, if one maintains their parts to be eternal, it becomes necessary to accept their parts to be temporal because of not being in conjunction form." (Hallul-Intebahat P. 136)

Says the Holy Quran: (He is the) Originator of the heavens and the earth. (2:117)

And the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) says:

كان الله ولم يكن معه شيئ[1]

"Allah was, and there was no other thing with him".

Thus, even according to the Islamic Tradition[2], it is necessary to affirm the temporality of matter.

This, then, is the refutation of the first error. We shall now turn to the second.

---

[1] ***Mishkaat-ul-Masaabeeh*** (It has also been narrated with a little bit different wordings though the meaning is same. In Sahih Bukhari (Hadith No 3191), it has been narrated with these wordings " كان الله ولم يكن شيئ غيره" (First of all, there was nothing but Allah).

[2] Scriptural texts / Revelation

Intimation (2)

REGARDING THE OMNIPOTENCE OF GOD

The substance of the first error, as we have been discussing, was to transfer (prove) an attribute peculiar to God alone to something other than God. And the substance of the second error is to negate one attribute of the perfection of God- that attribute being omnipotence. We say this because nowadays it has become too common a practice among people with a Western (modern) education to say or to write that nothing can ever happen contrary to the law of nature. They try to prove this assertion into two ways– sometimes they advance a rational argument, and sometimes they argue from the Traditional sources[1].

The rational argument they employ runs like this:- we observe, for example, that fire always burns, and have never seen the opposite; or, we daily observe that a child is born of its father and mother, and have never seen the opposite; hence, we can conclude that anything which violates the rule of nature would necessarily be a rational impossibility. It is on this principle that these people have denied miracles which are unusual or un-habitual things. They deny some of the miracles quite explicitly by repudiating the report itself, and in the case of others, where an outright rejection is not possible because of there being a definite and clear statement in the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith, they deny implicitly by resorting to false interpretations and rationalizations. This being their attitude to the miracles performed by the prophets, it is no wonder that they should summarily dismiss the miracles[2] performed by saints. And the basis of such a dismissal is always the same assumption that it is rationally impossible for things to go against the law of nature.

---

[1] Scriptural texts / Revelation
[2] Charismas (Karamaat)

Our readers can see for themselves that this assertion is a proposition which needs to be proved before it is accepted. And it would not serve as a valid argument to mention the more fact that one has never seen such a thing before. For, in this case the method of induction has been used. But, in employing this method, one observes only a few particulars out of many, and if we apply a general conclusion based on the observation of a few particulars to other particulars also, such a procedure cannot give us a certain proof. Of course, the conclusion may be taken to be proved, not in the degree of certainty but of probability only, for other particulars as well.

But this probability would be confirmed as a certain proof only when it is not contradicted by amore sound argument. And even in this situation, we can only say that it is always likely to happen like that, not that it must necessarily happen like that always –unless we can prove that it is impossible that it should not happen like that. In order to negate the possibility of the opposite proposition, one will have to produce a definite argument. If a more sound argument is already there to contradict the probability, the latter will not possess even this much efficacy, and one will have to follow that stronger argument.

Thus, when there is no argument to negate the possibility of the other alternative, and there is a stronger argument to prove for some particulars, the opposite of what has been posited for some other particulars, why should one not take this stronger argument to be conclusive? Or, why should one be guilty of subjecting this stronger argument to a farfetched interpretation? For, every secondary interpretation involves a turning away from the explicit and literal sense. So, one may not resort to it without there being a need for it. And here there is no need for it. Then, why should one adopt such a course? Otherwise, one can with equal case subject everything

to such conjectural interpretations, and by creating unnecessary doubts leave no text or evidence which could be used a conclusive argument.

Fallacy with the Qur'anic Verse upon Unnatural Events

The other way of attempting to establish this assertion is to appeal to the authority of the Islamic tradition[1] and to cite this verse of the Holy Qur'an as evidence:

ولن تجد لسنة الله تبديلا (القرآن)

"And you will never find a change in Allah’s consistence practice” (33:62)

This being a verse of the Holy Qur'an, it is, no doubt, an authentic argument. But whether this argument proves the proposition depends on two conditions. Firstly, the word “*Sunnah*” (way) should mean the way or practice of God in respect of all matters. Secondly, the agent of the "change" should be indefinite, and include God as well as other than God. But there are no arguments to prove these two contentions. In the context in which the word “*Sunnah*” occurs, it may, rather it does apply to certain particular and definite matters which have been explicitly mentioned in those verses, the substance of which is the domination of truth over falsehood either through a conclusive argument or by force of arms.[2] Even if we take the word "*Sunnah*" (way) to have a

---

[1] Revelation

[2] The issue has been elaborated at several places in *Imdadul-Fatawa* and *Bayanul-Quran*. The summary is as follows- "A person questioned about the verses of the Holy Qur'an, (فعال لما يريد (القرآن) (He is ever doer of what He intends) and (ولن تجد لسنة الله تبديلا (القرآن) (…and you will never find a change in Allah's consistent practice) that there is apparent contradiction between the two verses, because the first verse declares Allah does what He intends and no law can bar him to do so, and the second verse informs us that the way of Allah never changes. He does everything in conformity with His way and practice, not to the contrary. Some people, therefore, meant … (on P. 52)

wider and general connotation (namely, the practice of God in respect of all matters), the subject of the verb "to change" is not God, but other than God, and the verse actually means that no one else can possibly" change" the habitual way or usual practice of God, as does sometimes happen in our worldly life when a royal command is obstructed by the opposition of rebellious party. The purport of this phrase in the Holy Qur'an will then be to confirm the promise of reward and the threat of punishment already made.

Fallacy with the Qur'anic Verse and Human Intelligence upon Unnatural Events

We have come across even a third way of proving the assertion that nothing can go against the law of Nature, which is composed of rational argument and an argument based on Tradition[1]. Thus, it is said that "the habitual way of Allah" is a

---

… (from Page 51) Sunnah the laws of nature or power, but in such case, supernatural events and miracles break the laws. What would be the explanation of the verses then? To this query, M. Ashraf Ali Thanvi (RA) replies: "There is no doubt if we mean the agent of change other than God because it then implies that none has power to change the way and practice of God whether the Sunnah applies to certain particular and definite matters or a wider and general connotation, or a promise in the form of an act or a word. In that case, this verse will be closer in meaning to the verses like-

(1) So, they are looking for nothing but the (divine) practice (punishment and ruin) with the earlier people. So you will never find in Allah's practice any change, and you will never find in Allah's practice any diversion (that instead being tortured they are rewarded) (35-43). In short, Allah promises punishment to unbelievers, be it in the world alone or in the hereafter and Allah's promise never fails. There is no possibility that infidels are not afflicted nor others are likely to be punished instead. This repetition intends to confirm the execution of the punishment.

(2) The Word of your Lord is perfect in truth and justice. None is there to change His words, and He is All-Hearing, All-Knowing (6-115). The quality of perfection of the Holy Qur'an is that no one possesses the power to distort or change it.

[1]Revelation

promise in the form of an act and according to an explicit statement in the Holy Quran, it is impossible that a promise made by Allah should change. The first of these contentions (way of Allah is a promise in the form of an act) is rational, and the second (it is impossible that a promise should change according to an explicit statement) is traditional[1]. Now the second contention is true without any exception, while the first is not acceptable.

First Example: We shall explain what we mean by taking an example. We have already established that the material world is not eternal, but created and temporal. Now, let us suppose that the earth went on having rain in the rainy season year by year, and this became established as the habitual process. But there once came rainy season when there was a complete drought. This had happened for the first time, and it did not as yet form a part of the habitual process. If the habit of getting rains in the rainy season was “a promise in the form of an act”, how did things go against this promise?

Second Example: The variations of matter are all of them contingent and temporal. When a certain species appeared for the first time in matter, and the individual of the same species went on appearing for a long time, this became established as a habit. Now, was it, then, that the individuals of different species began to appear-either through evolution, as men of science say, or through germination, as people of truth have solidly established?

At this stage, one may raise still another objection and say that all this did not go against the habitual way, for the habitual way, in the real sense, is the sequence of physical causes and effects, and thence one should include all this divergent phenomena in the habitual way. To this new assertion we would reply that since physical causes themselves

[1] Based on revelation

are in need of being manipulated by the Divine Power and of being related to the Divine Will. This principle (i.e. physical causes produce certain effects) would itself have to depend on a more basic principle (i.e. physical causes are controlled by Divine Power and Will). So, the latter alone would genuinely be called the habitual way. And it would still hold good, even when things go against scientific laws. Seen from this point of view, what is seemingly opposed to the habitual way actually turns out to be in perfect conformity with it. As far as the external form is concerned, one may say that it is something opposed to the habitual way, but with regard to the essential reality (that Allah acted freely with his will and power and that is the habit of Allah, considering so), it has to be admitted that it is in complete accord with the habitual way. This being so, is there any special need for denying or distorting facts?

Intimation (3)

REGARDING PROPHET-HOOD

Nowadays one finds people committing a number of fatal errors with regard to prophet-hood.

The first of these errors concerns the nature of Revelation (*Wahy*). Some of those who pretend to be an authority on interpreting religious matters on the basis of their individual opinion, have expressed themselves on the subject in some such manner: “There are men who temperamentally have a passionate love for their nation and an extraordinary zeal for its welfare. On account of this passion, such a man is unremittingly dominated by thoughts of this nature. Since this domination amounts to an obsession, his imagination begins to provide him certain ideas. This obsession sometimes leads him to feel as if he is hearing a voice or seeing a shape, and sometimes this shape appears to be talking to him. But, as a matter of fact, this voice or speech has no objective and external existence, and all such things are no more than imaginary entities.”

REALITY OF REVELATION (WAHY)

But such an explanation of the nature of prophet-hood is directly opposed to the explicit and clear statements on the subject in the Holy Quran and the authentic traditions[1] of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), where we are told without a shade of ambiguity that revelation is a special favour which comes down to a prophet from Allah through the medium of an angel. This angel sometimes brings an inspiration (as the Hadith puts it:

[1] Hadiths

نفث في روعي (الحديث[1])

"He put into my heart"),

Sometimes his voice is heard and sometimes he appears and speaks in bodily form (as the Hadith states:

يأتيني الملك أحيانا فيتمثل لي (الحديث[2])

"Sometimes the Angel comes in the form of a man").

The followers of modern science reject such accounts, because they deny the very existence of the angels and without any valid argument too. We shall, with the help of Allah, examine this opinion in a subsequent Intimation (8)[3], while discussing the existence of angels, which will demonstrate that the existence of angels is not rationally impossible, and when a sound report is there to prove the existence of what is rationally possible, it becomes rationally necessary to affirm its existence (according to Principle No. 2[4]).

ATTEMPT TO MAKE MIRACLES USUAL EVENTS

The second error is related to the miracles, by which are meant those events that occur without the intervention of physical causes. The followers of science refuse to accept the

---

[1] Mishkaat -ul- Masabeeh, Hadith No 5300

[2] Narrated 'Aisha (the mother of the faithful believers):
Al-Harith bin Hisham asked Allah's Messenger(ﷺ) "O Allah's Messenger (ﷺ)! How is the Divine Inspiration (Wahy) revealed to you?"
Allah's Messenger(ﷺ) replied, "Sometimes it is (revealed) like the ringing of a bell, this form of Inspiration is the hardest of all and then this state passes off after I have grasped what is inspired. Sometimes the Angel comes in the form of a man and talks to me and I grasp whatever he says."
'Aisha added: Verily I saw the Prophet(ﷺ) being inspired divinely on a very cold day and noticed the sweat dropping from his forehead (as the Inspiration was over). (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith No 2)

[3] Intimation no 8 deals with "Reality of the Angels, the Jinns and Satans"

[4] Principle no 2 is- If a thing is rationally possible, and its existence is attested by sound report, then it is necessary to accept its existence. On the other hand if its non-existence is attested by sound report, then it is equally necessary to accept its non-existence.

occurrence of such events too, and again without any valid argument. For this reason, they proceed to make far-fetched rationalizations (which, in truth, are perversions) of the miracles which have been reported in the Holy Qur'an and Hadith, so that the miracles could be made to look like habitual facts. Some of these events are so thoroughly rationalized that they altogether cease to be unusual or extraordinary-as in the case of verse:

إضرب بعصاك الحجر (القرآن)

"Strike the rock with your staff" (2:60/7:160)

An incident reported of the prophet Moses (peace be on him) who had drawn water out of a rock by striking it with his stick. And when it is not possible to explain away the element of wonder, they classify a miracle under procedures like mesmerism or hypnotism-as in the case of the stick of the prophet Moses (peace be on him) changing into a dragon[1].

The argument which forms the basis of such a doubt has already been refuted under Intimation No. 2[2]. If one insists on seeking the physical causes of things, one will have to go on tracing one cause back to another, and the chain will continue as infinitum, which is impossible. Therefore, one must concede that an Omnipotent Being has created the physical causes themselves without the mediation of any physical cause. This being so, the same Omnipotent Being can, if He wishes, create the effects of physical causes too without the mediation of any physical cause. At the most, one can call such a thing improbable, but the improbable and the impossible are not identical. (See Principle No. 3[3])

---

[1] Serpent

[2] Intimation no. 2 is regarding the Omnipotence of God which explains that physical causes too are in need of Allah's will and power.

[3] Principle no 3 is- "what is rationally impossible is something totally different from what is merely improbable. The impossible is opposed to reason itself, while the improbable is opposed merely to habit."

NEGATING MIRACLES TO BE A PROOF OF PROPHET-HOOD

The third error is that miracles are not adjudged to be a proof of prophet-hood, but the excellence of a prophet's teaching and excellence of his moral conduct are supposed to be the only valid arguments for establishing his prophet-hood. But no arguments can be advanced in support of this limitation except that if supernatural events are taken to be a proof of prophet-hood, then mesmerism and conjuring tricks too will have to be considered as essential for prophet-hood. But it is a very flimsy argument, because mesmerism and conjuring tricks are not, in fact, supernatural events, but can be referred back to hidden physical causes, which the experts of such arts can easily detect, and thus rightfully deny the imposter who has been laying a claim to prophet-hood on this basis, and can even challenge him in the art of showing such tricks. But none of those who stood up to deny the miracles of the prophets (peace be on them)did ever point out to any such physical cause, nor could anyone successfully challenge them. This clearly goes to show that the miracles of the prophets are in actual fact supernatural. Therefore, miracles and conjuring tricks do not equally become necessary for prophet-hood-it is miracles alone which enjoy this title.

Of course, the excellence of teaching and the excellence of moral conduct too are proofs of prophet-hood. But divine wisdom has its own ways of disposing things. The audience of the prophets (peace be on them) was composed of two kinds of people. On the one hand were the elite- people who had intelligence enough to recognise the highest excellence of teaching and moral conduct (which is itself a miracle). On the other hand were the dull-witted ordinary people who, being unable to recognise the highest degree of excellence, could not derive the correct conclusion from the testimony of teaching and moral conduct, and were thus liable to the fatal error of

accepting every just and good man as a prophet. So, divine wisdom ordained a special mode of argument which should be proper to their level of understanding, and which should provide a compulsive recognition of the validity of the claim to prophet-hood, without requiring any exertion of the will or of the mind on their part. Moreover, they could not possibly confuse the prophets with conjurors, because they could see for themselves that experts in the arts of conjurors owned their helplessness to challenge them.[1]

The fourth error is that the teachings and injunctions of the Prophet are supposed to be exclusively concerned with the affairs of the other world, while in the affairs of this world, one is supposed to be absolutely independent of such injunctions. The Holy Qur'an and the Hadith believe such a supposition in explicit terms. For example, take this verse:

وَ مَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَّ لَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ اِذَا قَضَى اللّٰهُ وَ رَسُوْلُهٗۤ اَمْرًا اَنْ يَّكُوْنَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ اَمْرِهِمْ١ؕ وَ مَنْ يَّعْصِ اللّٰهَ وَ رَسُوْلَهٗ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ ضَلٰلًا مُّبِيْنًا (القرآن)

"It is not open for a believing man or a believing woman, once Allah and His messenger have decided a thing, that they should have a choice about their matter; and whoever disobeys Allah and His messenger, he indeed gets off the track, falling into an open error".(33:36)

The occasion on which this verse was revealed was actually a matter of purely mundane nature. As for the tradition[2] of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) usually called

---

[1] One should keep the following points in mind to avoid the fallacy with regard to miracles:

*Many things are closely associated with physical causes but are considered to be supernatural because being astonishing, as an example, (on P. 57) (from P. 56) controlling the elements to cause rain. To go for one of the causes and to determine to act is controlling power, but most of the people are unaware of that fact and take those events to be supernatural. (Malfoozat V18/P211)

[2] Hadith

"*Hadith-ul-Ta'bir*[1]", which has caused doubts in some minds, it is to be noted that it applies to matters regarding which the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) expressed a mare opinion or advice, and not to matters regarding which he laid down a definite injunction[2].In order to make the point still more clear we cite a rational instance. It is a matter of everyday experience that our worldly rulers, through the laws which they make, do interfere with our personal and private affairs too. Then, should the only true and real ruler not have this right?

THINKING INJUNCTIONS OF SHARIAH REGARDING WORLDLY AFFAIRS MODIFIABLE WITH THE CHANGES OF TIME

A fifth error comes out of the fourth as a corollary. That is to say, it is supposed that the injunctions of the *Shariah* regarding worldly affairs may be modified in accordance with requirements of every age. Had these injunctions not been laid down as ends in themselves (as is the substance of the fourth error), there would not have been any harm in holding such an opinion. But, since it is an established fact that they are ends in

[1] This Hadith relates how the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) asked the people of Madina not to intergraft male and female palm trees, but when the yield turned out to be scanty that year, he remarked: أنتم أعلم بأمور دنياكم (مشكوة)
"You yourselves know better the affairs of your world."

[2] Affairs are of two kinds: the first one belongs to experiences as to why we act it for gain, why to cultivate to reap the harvest, why to plough the fields, what time seeding is appropriate: these are the experiences. The second one belongs to the prescribed teachings (legalities), as such kind of (on P. 58) (from P. 57) business will lead you to the interest and that is unlawful (Haram), such business, for example, is lawful. It means the rulings of lawfulness and unlawfulness, though, related to the worldly affairs, are the cases established by the Shariah. We, therefore, are bound to follow these instructions in such economic affairs too and an intergrafing palm tree is a kind of experiences. (Malfoozat-e-HakimulUmmat- V 12 MaqalatHikmat V 1 P 147)

themselves (as we have shown while refuting the fourth error[1]), there is no room at all for such a contention.

Here one may put forth a rational objection to this effect: the needs and requirements of human life keep on changing with every age, and this has been the ground for the abrogation and supersession of every *Shariah* (divine legislation) prior to Islam. How can it, then, be possible that, on the one hand, during the mere six centuries that lie between Jesus Christ (peace be on him) and the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) the needs and requirements of mankind underwent such a radical change that a new dispensation became necessary, but, on the other hand during more than double the period which has passed since the days of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) upto our own day, those needs and requirements have not yet suffered the slightest change?

To this objection we would reply that if the Legislator is perfect in His wisdom, and is also Omniscient, it is quite possible for Him to frame, when He so wishes, a set of law which can fulfil the needs and requirements of all the successive ages extending upto the day of judgement.

DOUBT OF OBSTRUCTION IN BUSINESS WHILE PRACTICING SHARIAH

Arguing from the conditions prevailing in the modern world, one may still raise a doubt, and say that one daily observes that if one tries to follow the *Shariah*, one has to face many obstructions in conducting the ordinary business of life, which only shows that its injunctions are not suitable for this age. We would reply that the complaint about life becoming

[1] The fourth error is that the teachings and injunctions of the Prophet are supposed to be exclusively concerned with the affairs of the other world, while in the affairs of this world, one is supposed to be absolutely independent of such injunctions.

difficult can be justifiable only if all the people follow the *Shariah*, and yet the business of life should get obstructed. And this nobody can prove. The difficulties which one has to experience these days are due to the fact that those who do not follow the *Shariah* far outnumber those who do, and when this minority has to deal with that majority, a tension is sure to follow. Thus, the real source of the difficulties is our present way of life, and not the injunctions of the *Shariah*[1]. It is just like a physician instructing a patient to eat ten different things, and the patient not being able to get any of these in his village. The impediment, in this case, lies not in the science of medicine, but in the condition of the village market.

As a matter of fact no real difficulty arises at all in following the *Shariah*. It is only the fear of some personal loss that conjures up a suspicion that the *Shariah* is very restrictive and difficult to be practiced. But is there any system of law in existence which does not entail and tolerate individual loss for the sake of public good?

INVENTING RAISONS D'ÊTRE OF INJUNCTIONS ON THE BASIS OF PERSONAL OPINION

The sixth error is again related to injunctions of the *Shariah*. Some people invent certain *raisons d'être* for these injunctions on the basis of their personal opinion, and insist on

---

[1]There is no obstruction (hardship) in religion. Had there been obstruction (hardship), the Prophet (saw) would not have stated: "Religion is easy". And one who thinks difficulty in it, it's his fault only. I give an example about it: there is a straight path, where there is no turn, and is as wide as four cars can move on and there are trees on either sides of the road. And it is the case of Ophthalmology and it is observed also that the sight reaching far gets so narrowed that the trees look joined together. Now the person not known to the fact will not dare to proceed ahead. He has doubt the road is closed ahead. But one who is aware of the fact will say, "Start your journey, do not lose heart, and move as long as the road is open, then the road ahead will look open."(Malfoozat-V. 4 P. 72/73)

making the validity of the injunctions depend solely on the presence or absence of these very *raisons d'être*. In consequence of this, they start misinterpreting, distorting and even annulling the injunctions laid down by the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith. Thus, we have heard of some people who somehow convinced themselves that the *raisons d'être* of the ritual ablutions (*wudhu*) was no more than cleanliness, and finding themselves clean enough, did not think it necessary to perform the ablutions at all before offering prayers. There have been others who imagined that the *raison d'être* of the ritual prayers was moral perfection, and taking the attainment of this merit to be the desired and gave up the daily prayers altogether. The same kinds of encroachments have been made in the case of other forms of worship like fasting, zakat (ritual alms-giving) and the pilgrimage to Mecca. In the same way, the prohibitions in the *Shariah* too, like interest and pictures of living beings etc., have been subjected to similar distortions. In short, such people have abrogated the *Shariah* totally.

Apart from such a procedure being a patent heresy, the contentions put forth by such people are mere assertions unsupported by any rational argument. For, it is not rationally possible that a large number of these injunctions should be forms of worship and intended to develop devotion and piety in man, and that, in putting man under the obligations to obey these commandments, the real *raison d'être* should be to test his fidelity and faith? Besides that, is there any argument to prove that *raisons d'être* which have been suggested by such people are the only possible ones? It is equally possible that the real *raisons d'être* should be those effects which emanate from the generic form of particular injunctions, just as the efficacy of certain medicines (nay, of all medicines) emanates from their respective, specific virtues.[1]

---

[1] Specific virtues mean the benefit emanates when it is found with its generic form. Some substances are useful in specific form. It, therefore, becomes possible to derive the benefit from other thing …(on page 64)

As far as the search for *raisons d'être* in itself is concerned, it is quite possible that one man may hit upon one thing, and another upon a different thing. What would, then, be the rational criterion for preferring one opinion to another? According to the well-known rule that when two propositions contradict each other, both of them are overthrown, we shall have to declare both of them are invalid. Though this process of elimination, finally the injunctions of the *Shariah* themselves would be demolished and annulled. This being so, would any sensible Muslim, who intended to remain faithful to his religion, choose to countenance such a procedure?

INVENTING RAISONS D'ÊTRE IN SECONDARY INJUNCTIONS ON THE BASIS OF PERSONAL OPINION

A corollary of the same error is that some people, in defending Islam against its detractors, try to justify the secondary injunctions of the *Shariah* by advancing similar rationalizations and *raisons d'être.*

Now, there is a great danger in adopting such a procedure. The *raisons d'être* thus suggested are purely conjectural. If any of them is found to be questionable, the related injunction itself thereby becomes dubious and defective. Thus, it amounts to providing for the detractors of Islam with a permanent opportunity for disputing and negating the Islamic injunctions.[1]

… (from page 63) of the same form. For example: if Salah (prayer) had been in the likeness of the medicine, useful in form, it would have been possible that the other thing would have given the same benefit, which is of the Salah (prayer). But Salah (prayer) is not useful in the form but is like the medicine useful with its specific virtues, i.e. if the same format with its generic form exists, the same benefit and nearness, promised on it, will result. (Malfoozat- V.13, Maqalat-e-Hikmat-V.2, P138)

[1] Most of the people are affected with the disease to find raisons d'être in the injunctions of Shariah. When they fail to find it, they … (on page 65)

The truth of the matter is that these injunctions are laws, and no one does ever seek secret motives in legal rules and regulations, nor does one have the right to change, or alter or abrogate laws on the ground of the imagined secret motives. It is the legislator himself who alone possesses these powers.

No doubt, the authentic and great "*Mujtahidun*" (or, the masters of Islamic law who enjoy sufficient authority to deduce subsidiary regulations from explicit injunctions) have, in the early centuries of Islamic history, sometimes pointed out the *raisons d'être* of certain injunctions. But this example should not mislead one to appropriate this privilege to oneself. Those great masters had, firstly, to fulfil an essential need. That is to say, there are certain things about which there are no explicit decisions either in the Holy Qur'an or in the Hadith and hence it was necessary to deduce regulations for such things from the explicit injunctions with regard to things of a similar nature. Secondly, they had the requisite talent for making such deductions. But nowadays both the factors are absent. In the case of our modernists, besides the paucity of knowledge, the pursuit of one's desires is the thickest veil which conceals the truth from their eyes.

ADVOCATING SALVATION TO THOSE WHO DENY PROPHETHOOD

…(from page 64) present the wisdom as raison d'être in response to the objecting people, whereas, upon which the ruling is resulted is called raison d'être and wisdom itself is the result of ruling. Then, both of them are different from each other. Moreover, where determination of wisdom is not stipulated, it is, since, conjectural, has the strong possibility of being the opposite side. So, if ever, this wisdom is scarified, the injunctions of Allah will also be scarified. The careful way is to say that the injunctions surely have wisdom but where the lawgiver has not determined it; we also should avoid it and continue to practice it as the submission to the injunction of Allah. (Malfoozat- V.12, Maqalat-e-Hikmat- V.1, P. 115)

The Seventh Error, and the most fatal of all, is that some people are prepared to allow the possibility of salvation even to those who deny prophet-hood. Their contention is that the prophets (peace be on them) themselves came for the purpose of affirming the unity of God, therefore, in so far as a man has attained the intended object, it does him no harm to deny something which was not intended to be the ultimate object.

A summary and traditional refutation of this opinion is provided by those verses of the Holy Qur'an and those pronouncements in the Hadith which explicitly state that those who deny prophet-hood shall be placed in hell forever. And the rational refutation is that he who denies the prophet denies God, for, in doing so, he is denying God’s word- that is, verses of the Holy Qur'an like:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ (القرآن)

“Muhammad is the messenger of Allah”. (48:29)

And a precedent from the worldly life is this. If a man were to acknowledge George Vas his king, but were to keep defying the viceroy of India, would his behaviour be considered meritorious or even pardonable by the king?

Intimation (4)

REGARDING THE HOLY QURAN AS ONE OF THE FOUR SOURCES OF THE *SHARIAH*

It is an established fact that there are four sources of the *Shariah*: (1) the Holy Qur'an (2) the Hadith, or the Traditions of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), (3) *Ijma-ul-Ummah*, or the consensus of opinion on the part of the authentic scholars of the Islamic sciences, and (4) *Qayas-ul-Mujtahid*, or the inference made by a recognized master of Islamic law, who should fulfil certain definite conditions in order to enjoy such an authority. But nowadays people are committing grave errors with regard to each of these four sources in one way or another.

With regard to the Holy Qur'an, two errors have become quite common.

Firstly, the injunctions of the *Shariah* are supposed to be contained exclusively in the Qur'an. The upshot of this error is the denial and rejection of the other three sources.

Secondly, an attempt is made to bring the verses of the Holy Qur'an into conformity with the theories of modern science through fanciful interpretations, and also to prove that the Holy Qur'an propounds and confirms these very theories.

FIRST ERROR:

INJUNCTIONS OF SHARIAH ARE SUPPOSED TO BE CONTAINED IN THE QURAN

The first of these errors is clearly refuted by those verses of the Holy Qur'an and those traditions[1] of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) which prove that the other three sources too must be accepted as valid and binding. This point

[1] Hadiths

has been discussed with all possible elaborations by the scholars of Islamic jurisprudence.

A corollary of the same error is that when a man desires to commit a certain sin and an attempt is made to keep him back from it, he at once demands that a clear prohibition for this particular sin should be shown in the Holy Qur'an. For example, one daily finds such demands being made in the newspapers with regard to the injunction about keeping a beard. This practice has become almost a second nature for modernized Muslims, so much so that whenever a detractor of Islam demands that the proof of a certain thing should be produced from the Holy Qur'an, they accede to this demand unquestioningly, and, taking the burden of proof upon themselves, go about in search of it. And when they cannot find it for themselves, they insist that the *Ulema* (scholars) should somehow provide a proof from the Holy Qur'an.

But we have already established that the very basis of this corollary is wrong. So, it is quite evident that proposition based on a false premise must also be false, and should not require a separate refutation.

Moreover, opening the door to this kind of argumentation would be an act of extreme recklessness, and betray a lack of foresight. The only thing it can ultimately lead to is that one shall be forced to concede that the five “pillars’’ of Islam (that is, the principal forms of worship) themselves cannot be proved to have any basis in the *Shariah*. Can anyone establish the prescribed number “*rak’ats*” (sets of movement during ritual prayer) for the five daily prayers on the basis of the Holy Qur'an, or determine as to who is required to pay the "zakat" (the ritual alms-giving) and how much, and so on?

A concrete example would make the absurdity of this demand all the more clear. Supposing that a plaintiff produces a witness in a court of law in support of his claim, the

defendant would certainly have the legal right to cross-examine him. But if the witness comes out clean after such a cross-examination, the defendant would not have the further right of submitting before the court that, in spite of this witness being unblemished and trustworthy, he would not accept the claim until and unless such a dignitary or prominent person gives his evidence in its support instead of this man. If he were to make such a demand, would the court listen to him?

This is the real point behind the well-established rule of the art of polemics that one may justifiably demand an argument as such from one who makes an assertion, but not a particular kind of argument. It has also been clarified that the negation of the argument does not necessarily involve the negation of the subject matter of the argument (or of what is sought to be proved). Because an argument is the subsidiary while a subject in the principal and the negation of what is subsidiary does not necessarily involve the negation of what is principal.

Therefore, a man who makes the claim that such an injunction has been established on the basis of the *Shariah* has the right to prove contention of the basis of any argument that he chooses from the *Shariah*. No one does have a justifiable right to challenge him, and to demand a particular kind of argument-for example, an argument based on the Holy Qur'an alone.[1]

---

[1] A person questioned Maulana Thanvi (ra): Is the Quran perfect and complete book for religion? If it is, then what is the need to explain it with traditions (Hadiths) and sayings of the Prophet (saw). If it is not, then, what is the meaning of the words of these verses of the Quran, like: “a detailed explanation of everything”, “detail of the verses”, “it is He Who has sent down unto you the Book (The Qur'an), explained in detail”, “and then explained in detail”, “is it not sufficient for them that We revealed to you the Book which is recited to them?”, and “We have neglected nothing in the Book”, etc.? Answer: Being perfect and complete of a thing means the objective is achieved completely from the thing it is designed for. (on P. 70)

Of course, one must admit that the four kinds of arguments, drawn respectively from the four sources of the *Shariah*, vary in force of validity, even as the respective subjects of these arguments, or the injunctions that are sought to be proved, vary. Thus the injunctions are of four kinds:-

(1) Those which have been established on the basis of a definitive and conclusive argument, and also have a definite signification.

(2) Those which have been established on the basis of an approximative argument, and have an approximative signification.

(3) Those which have been established on the basis of a definitive argument but have an approximative signification.

(4) Those which have been established on the basis of an approximative argument but have a definite signification.

But, in spite of these variations in the degree of validity, no one has the authority to reject even approximative injunctions. Do we not see many a judge, against whose

---

(from P. 69) The main purpose of the Quran is to prove Oneness of Allah and the Hereafter. Therefore, after pondering over the verses, it becomes clear that the words like "*tafseel* (detail), *mufassal* (detailed), etc. are according to the same content (mentioned) and in كل شئ (everything), the wholeness is comparative and usual not actual. It means the aims and the objectives the holy Quran revealed for, i.e. the guidance, redressing the hereafter and its principle issues are all included in it. تِبْيَانًا لِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ (clarification for all the things) has the same meaning here, i.e. the important issues of *deen* (religion), not the details of offshoots here. And أَوَلَمْ يَكْفِهِمْ أَنَّا أَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ (Is it not sufficient for them that We have sent down to you the Book (the Qur'an) means the sufficient arguments on the Prophet-hood. In مَا فَرَّطْنَا (We have neglected nothing in the Book), the book here means "The Preserved Tablet" (Lauh-e-Mahfooz), and in يسرنا, ***zikr*** means "to understand and remember the words" and "inducement and intimidation". (Imdadul-Fatawa, Malfoozat-V.6, P. 78, Malfoozat-V.10, P356-to-358)

judgment no appeal can lie, often pronouncing his judgement on the mere ground that he has thought fit to apply to a case brought before him a certain section of the legal code, and though the section of the code is definitive, his decision that the particular case falls under that section is approximative? The substance of such a judgement would be that particular section of the code has been established definitively, but its application is approximative in other words, it rests on a definitive argument, but its signification is approximative. But everyone can see for himself what the consequences would be, if one were to question that judgement. So much about the first error, that is being committed with regard to the Holy Qur'an.

SECOND ERROR:

EXAGGERATION IN APPLYING THEORIES OF MODERN SCIENCE IN THE QURAN

The second error is the attempt to make out as if the Holy Quran comprises the theories of modern science. Thus, one too often finds in newspapers and journals nowadays that as people come across a scientific discovery made in the west, they try as best as they can to discover an indication of this theory in some verse of the Holy Qur'an. This is supposed to be a great service to Islam, a matter of commendation for the Holy Qur'an and a proof of one's own intelligence. What is worse, even some religious scholars have been found to be guilty of this error.

THERE ARE FOUR DEFECTS IN THE SECOND ERROR

First Defect: BELIEVING SCIENTIFIC THEORIES TO BE THE MEANING AND PURPOSE OF THE QURAN

What is basically wrong with this approach is that it is supposed to be a mark of the highest perfection for the Holy

Qur'an to contain scientific theories. The reason for this misconception is that no regard has been paid as to what the essential subject matter of the Holy Qur'an is.

The Holy Qur'an in fact, is not a book of physical science, nor of history, nor of geography. It is a book which deals with the cure of souls, just as books on medicine deal with the cure of bodies. It would not be a defect or deficiency in a book on medicine, if it does not discuss the problems of shoe-making or cloth-wearing. Indeed, a slight reflection will show that in a way it would be a defect and imperfection for this book, if it were to discuss such problems unnecessarily, because it would only produce confusion. On the other hand, not to discuss such things would be a merit of this book.

Similarly, it is not at all a defect or deficiency in the Holy Qur'an, which is essentially a book on spiritual medicine, that it does not discuss the problems of physical science. In fact, it is a merit of a kind.

However, if spiritual treatment should sometimes require that a problem of physical science to be discussed, such a discussion would be no more than a concession to this need. But, according to the established rule[1] that what is necessary is determined by the extent of necessity, this discussion would not exceed the extent of necessity. For example, the affirmation of the unity of God is the most fundamental principle in the science of curing souls. The easiest and simplest way of establishing this principle is to argue on the basis of the different forms of the creation while doing this, the Holy Qur'an has now and then dealt, very briefly, with themes like the creation of the heavens and the earth, of men and beasts etc. Since the occasion did not require any details, they have been left out.

---

[1] الضرورة تتقدر بقدر الضرورة (what is necessary is determined by the extent of necessity)

In short, it is not one of the main objects of the Holy Qur'an to deal with the problems of physical science. If any such problems have been touched upon, it is only by way of an argument or illustration in support of some of its basic theme. In so far as the Holy Qur'an has made an explicit and definite statement on a scientific problem, that statement is certain and finally true, and it is not permissible to believe in its opposite on the basis of some other argument. If there is an argument which seems to contradict the statement in the Holy Qur'an, one would, on careful examination, find that either the argument itself was defective, or the contradiction was not real but merely apparent. Of course, it is quite possible that the verse in question does not have definitively explicit meaning, and that a valid argument can be found to prove the possible of the apparent meaning. In such a case, the verse would not be taken in the literal sense, but given a secondary interpretation (as we have shown under Principle No. 7[1]).

SECOND DEFECT: ARGUING WITH THE PREMISES UNACCEPTABLE, NON-AXIOMATIC AND UN-AFFIRMED

Let us now turn to another misunderstanding. We have shown above that it is not one of the basic objects of the Holy Qur'an to deal with scientific problems. Such problems find a mention merely as premises for proving the main proposition. And it is clear enough that when one is arguing to establish a certain proposition the premises must be such as are, even before the proposition is affirmed, already acceptable to the audience, or are of the nature of axioms, or have been made acceptable through proper arguments; otherwise it would not be possible to employ them as valid arguments in favour of the proposition.

---

[1] Only four situations are rationally possible in which there can be a contradiction between a rational argument and argument based on report (see on page 36)

With this basic rule in mind, let us now try to realize that if the theories of modern science are what the verses of the Holy Qur'an are meant to indicate and to connote, and, as we know, the Arabs, who formed the earliest audience for the Holy Qur'an, were totally ignorant of these modern theories, then the only and the necessary conclusion would be that the Holy Qur'an has been arguing with them on the basis of certain premises which were neither universally acceptable, nor axiomatic, nor had yet been established through proof, and were *ipso facto* worthless as a basis for any valid argument. If one were to accept this situation, what a great blemish would it be on the word of God and its mode of argument!

THIRD DEFECT: DEMOLITION OF A PART NECESSARILY IMPLIES THE DEMOLITION OF THE WHOLE

The third great defect in this approach is that scientific theories are sometimes proved to be wrong. Now supposing that these theories are accepted to be the purport of the Holy Qur'an, and Muslims come to believe, according to this interpretation, that the Holy Qur'an has made such and such affirmations in such and such verses. If any one of these scientific theories is some day proved to be wrong, how easy would it be for the meanest detractor of Islam (atheist) to deny the Holy Qur'an itself. For, he would say that such a statement in the Holy Qur'an is wrong, and since the demolition of apart necessarily implies the demolition of the whole, he would go on to assert that the Holy Qur'an itself is not true. How difficult would it then be to defend the Holy Qur'an?[1]

[1] A person wanted to prove from the Quran that in grain, there is half male and half female. This too is the finding of modern science. He, therefore, found the verse of Surah Yasin no. 36: “Pure (from every fault) is the One who has created all the pairs of whatever the earth grows and of the human themselves and of which they do not know.” It resulted that in this verse there are pairs i.e. male and female. Whatever one understands, ...(on P.75)
…(from P. 74) says but we do not know what they would say about: وإذا النفوس

One may possibly raise an objection here, and claim, as some have actually done, that it is a peculiar perfection of the Holy Qur'an that its words are found to be in consonance with whatever scientific theories happen to enjoy currency in any age. If this is so, then it necessarily means that no connotation of the verses of the Holy Qur'an should at all be trustworthy, for every connotation would leave sufficient room for the possibility of its opposite being equally true. This strange claim reminds us of the well-known story of a clever astrologer. When a man came to ask him if he was going to have a son or a daughter, he would say in a flat tone-- "no son no daughter". Later on, he would fit his words to the actual situation just by repeating them in different tones, and saying, “No son, no! --- Daughter”, or, “No, son!... no daughter”. Would it be just to call such a book a source of guidance for mankind?

FOURTH DEFECT: EUROPEAN SCHOLARS UNDERSTOOD THE QURAN MORE COMPREHENSIVELY THAN THE MUSLIM COMMENTATORS

The fourth defect in this approach is that it totally goes against our self-respect, for if we make the interpretation of the Holy Qur'an dependent upon scientific discoveries, would not the European scholars point out that although the Qur'an was

---

زوجت (and when the people will be arranged in categories) (Surah At-Takwir Verse no. 7) Brothers! The way that has been chosen is severely harmful because when you chose a new finding to make the meaning of the verse of the Quran, for example: grain of a plant contains male and female and after a hundred years, this finding proves to be false and instead a new research takes place, in this case, it would require to falsify the words of Allah too. Thus, such people are becoming the evidence of the verse of Hood no 19: يَصُدُّونَ عَن سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ (The ones who prevent (people) from the way of Allah and seek crookedness in it). (Malfoozat-V. 2, P.276).
And supposing that, it does not prove to be wrong in future, in this case too, making this finding the meaning of the Quran requires saying that the verse was revealed hundred years ago and no one understood its true meaning, from the companions till today and the meaning became clear after science explained it.

revealed such a long time ago, yet no Muslim, not even the Holy Prophet himself (peace be on him) has ever understood it, and that the Muslims should be grateful to the West for having made it possible for them to understand and interpret the Qur'an correctly? Were they to say so, what reply could we have?

So far we have dealt with the errors that are being committed with regard to the Holy Qur'an. Now, we turn to the other sources of the *Shariah* and to the errors that are committed regarding them.

Intimation (5)

REGARDING THE HADITH AS ONE OF THE FOUR SOURCES OF THE *SHARIAH*

FIRST ERROR: BELIEVING TRADITIONS OF THE PROPHET (SAW) ARE NOT WELL PRESERVED

The prevalent error with regard to the Hadith is that it is supposed that the traditions[1] of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)are not authentic, and have not been handed down to us intact either as to their text or as to their substance. The texts are supposed to be of doubtful authenticity, because the traditions were not complied in a written form during the life time of the Holy Prophet himself (peace be on him), but were reported orally from man to man, and a memory strong enough to retain the words exactly is something unnatural. The substance of the Traditions is similarly supposed to be doubtful, because everyone who heard something from the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) could perforce understand it only in his own way–which might be in accord with what the Prophet (peace be on him) had really meant, or be even opposed to it, and, being unable to retain the very words, reported to others only what he himself had understood, and thus even the substance could not remain intact.

So, when neither the texts nor the contents are authentic, how can the Hadith serve as a valid authority? (And this is the substance of the objection raised by the new–fangled sect, the *Qur'aniah*, who believe the Holy Qur'an to be the only source of the *Shariah*.)

SECOND ERROR: SUPPOSING TRADITIONS[2] ARE NOT AUTHENTIC

---

[1] Hadiths
[2] Hadiths

(1) STORIES/ EVIDENCES OF MEMORY POWER

In fact, this error results from disregarding the lives of the early *Muhaddithun* and the *Fuqaha* (the compilers of the Traditions[1] and the Muslim Jurists). Some people have simply imagined them to be like themselves in the matter of a weak memory, a want of zeal, and a lack of piety. Their great power of memory is established by a large number of incidents reported about them, which one after the other bear out the same fact. For example, (1) the companion *Ibn Abbas* heard a poem of one hundred couplets only once, and ever afterwards it was preserved in his memory; or, once in an assembly, (2) one hundred Traditions[2] were recited before the great master of the science of Hadith, *Imam Bukhari*, with the texts and their names of the authorities deliberately mixed up, and he pointed out the errors corrected every one of the Traditions, and repeated the authentic versions of all the hundred traditions word by word; or, (3) another master of this science, *Imam Tirmidhi*, now blind, while passing by a certain spot, bowed his head as if he was passing under a tree, and, on being asked for the reason, reported that there used to be a tree there which was now missing, and the report was, on investigation, found to be quite true; or, (4) the masters of the science of Hadith from time to time used to request their own masters to repeat the same Traditions in order to test their memory, and never found a word more nor less. All this is quite well-known, and has been narrated in biographies or histories or in the detailed catalogues of the reporters of the traditions[3], and should suffice to establish the great power of memory these masters possessed. (5) If one looks carefully into these catalogues, one would find that the traditions[4] reported by people with a weak

---

[1] Hadiths

[2] Hadiths

[3] The Arabic term for "detailed catalogues of the reporters of the Traditions (Hadiths)" is أسماء الرجال (Asmaur-Rijaal)

[4] Hadiths

memory have been excluded from the category of "*Sahih*" (or the most authentic) traditions. This again is a sufficient proof of the scrupulous care that the masters of this science have taken in determining the authenticity of the tradition.

(2) DIVINE HELP

Besides the power of memory, there is another factor as well. Since Allah the almighty had chosen these masters for this task, their faculty for remembering things had been strengthened with divine help. For example, a Hadith relates how the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) recited a few words over the sheet of cloth while *Hazrat Abu-Hurairah* was wearing, and the latter pressed it to his breast.

A DOUBT:

It would not be proper to raise the objection here that we have just presented a Hadith in support of our argument, while the very validity of the Hadith as such is in dispute. As a matter of fact, all the traditions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) are not in dispute, but only those which have bearing on the injunctions of the *Shariah*. The tradition we have just referred to only relates an incident. Such traditions fall into a category of the science of history, which is unanimously accepted as a valid standard of reference in an argument.

REPLY TO THE STORY OF ABU-HURAIRAH GOING AGAINST THE LAW OF NATURE

But if one were to object that this story goes against the law of nature, then we have already given our reply under Intimation No. 3, while discussing miracles[1]. Moreover, we

---

[1] Regarding Prophet-hood that physical causes are controlled by Divine Power and will. If one insists on seeking the physical causes of things, one will have to go on tracing one cause back to another, and the chain will

would even dispute the assertion that it goes against the law of nature. Mesmerists can so influence the imagination of their subject that unknown things become disclosed to him, and known things disappear or are obliterated. Far be it from us to suggest that the influence which the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) exercised over *Hazrat Abu-Harirah* was of a similar kind. We only want to point out that it is not absolutely correct to consider this incident as something which goes against the law of nature. Even so, then it is a miracle, and we have already settled this issue (under Intimation no. 3, error no. 2, that miracles occur with divine help only, without the intervention of physical causes). Besides, we have ourselves heard of people, quite close our own day, who possessed an extraordinary memory. One such man was *Hafiz Rahmatullah* of Allahabad. We have personally met people who had seen his performance for themselves, and have heard stories about him from them.

(A) ZEAL OF TRANSMITTING EXACT TRADITIONS

So much for the power of memory, now, as to the zeal of these masters for committing the Traditions[1] to memory and for transmitting them intact, (1) the incentive behind this zeal was that the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)has offered a special prayer for such a man:

نضر الله عبدا سمع مقالتي فحفظها ووعاها وأداها كما سمعها (الحديث[2])

---

continue as infinitum, which is impossible. Therefore, one must concede that an Omnipotent Being has created the physical causes themselves without the mediation of any physical cause.

[1] Hadiths

[2] It was narrated that Anas bin Malik said: "The Messenger of Allah(ﷺ) said: ‘May Allah beautify a man who hears my words and understands them, then he conveys them from me. There are those who … (on P. 81)

…(from P. 80) have knowledge but no understanding, and there may be those who convey knowledge to those who may have more understanding of it than they do'".(Sunan Ibn Majah, Hadith No 236)

“May Allah beautify a man who hears a saying of mine (Hadith), so he remembers it, understands it, and conveys it to others exactly as he has heard." (Hadith)

So, those great masters made all possible efforts to be worthy of this prayer, and hence their anxiety to transmit the tradition as exactly as possible. (2) They had also a great dread of the least alteration, because they had heard this from the Holy Prophet (peace be on him):

من كذب علي ما لم أقله فليتبوأ مقعده من النار (الحديث[1])

"Whoever (intentionally) lies upon me (ascribes to me) what I have not said then (surely) let him occupy his seat in Hell-fire." (Hadith)

Some of the companions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) stood in such a dread of it that they never related a tradition[2] at all. (3) Then, the great masters of the science of Hadith so often, in the case of lengthy traditions, used to qualify their report of the tradition by giving alternative words in the text or by saying, “This or something like this”, etc. This is a clear proof of their scrupulousness and of their anxiety[3] to preserve the authenticity of even words. This being the case, one can see no harm if the traditions were not compiled in a written form in the days of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) himself.

On careful consideration, one would, indeed, admit that this fact has been very helpful and efficacious in preserving the authenticity of the tradition. For, so long as a man is habituated to write things down and has come to depend on memoranda,

---

1 Narrated Salama: I heard the Prophet ﷺ) saying, "Whoever (intentionally) ascribes to me what I have not said then (surely) let him occupy his seat in Hell-fire ". (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith No 109)
2 Hadith
3 Diligence

his memory does not come into full exercise, while every human faculty needs exercise in order to grow. We have often seen quite illiterate people working out lengthy sums orally. On the other hand, literate people can remember nothing unless they have written it down. This is one reason why people in our own day have such a weak memory. The other reason has been indicated above. That is to say, Allah the almighty had given the early masters a very strong memory, for he had chosen them for the task of compiling the traditions[1], and consequently compiling the injunctions of the *Shariah* on the basis of the traditions. This task has already been completed for the most part, and what still remains to be done does not require a strong memory.

(B) DIVINE NATURE

And it is a law of nature ordained by Allah that certain human faculties are specially developed in consonance with the special needs of a certain age. For example, the development of the special mental faculty required for the scientific discoveries and inventions in our own day too well illustrates the point.

RAISON D'ÊTRE OF NOT WRITING THE TEXT OF TRADITIONS IN THE BEGINNING

If the traditions[2] were not written down in those early days, the *raison d'être* was that the text of the Holy Qur'an should not get mixed up with that of the Hadith. Later on, when the text of the Holy Qur'an became established in full and final security and that danger of confusion had been eliminated, and moreover, when different misguided sects began to appear, it then became necessary to compile the traditions as a matter of precaution against misrepresentation

[1] Hadiths
[2] Hadiths

and in order to fortify the faith. Thus, the traditions[1] began to be compiled with the greatest possible care. And if one makes a thorough examination of the text of the traditions, of the “chains” of the authorities, of the proofs of their authenticity, and of the catalogues of their names and their biographies, one cannot help being deeply convinced that the words and the deeds of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) have been preserved without the least change or alteration.

What we have been saying just now applies even to that category of the tradition which is called “Aahad”- that is to say, a tradition which has been reported by one or very few persons in any period. But if we take all the compilations of the traditions together, and examine the text along with the authorities, we shall find that the texts are often identical and the authorities many and diverse, which gives them the status of "*mutwatir*". A tradition of this category precludes the necessity of questioning the credibility of reporters, for a *"mutwatir*" Hadith (a tradition that has been reported by many reporters in each generation in several consecutive chains) does not depend for its validity of the integrity, good memory or sound judgement of individual reporters.[2]

---

[1] Hadiths

[2] The texts in the Quran about the obedience of the Prophet (saw) order to act upon the traditions (Hadiths) of the Prophet (saw). ... Therefore, in the sense, the injunctions of the traditions (Hadiths) are the injunctions of the Quran. (Hawadisul Fatawa-V2, P.44)

To us, the difference in argumentative nature of the Quran and Tradition (the Hadith) is that since the Quran is proved with consecutive chains (Tawatur), they are, therefore, definite and the traditions (Hadiths) which are in consecutive chain enjoy the same status. However, the traditions reported by one or very few people in any period, are not definite but to accept them are obligatory and necessary. (Ashrafut-Tafasir-V.2 P.27) because the traditions are the revelation, though not recited, … (on P. 84)
…(from P. 83) and, on behalf of Allah, are the commentaries of the Quran. They, therefore, have the same status.

CRITICIZING PARTICULAR TRADITION ON THE BASIS OF DIRAYAT (REASON)

Now that we have established how the Hadith is a final argument and a valid source for canonical law, it must also have become clear why it is wrong to criticize particular tradition[1] on the basis of "*Dirayat*"[2] (reasons) for, the lowest degree of authentic tradition is that in which the authenticity and the connotation both should be approximative, while the substance of what people nowadays call "*Dirayat*" (reasons) is only a rational argument of conjectural nature. We have already shown under Principle No. 7[3] that an argument based on an approximative report is to be preferred to a rational argument of approximative nature.

REPORTING THE SENSE AND ITS REALITY

As for the objection that, in the case of some tradition, it is the sense alone which has been reported, and not the actual words, we agree that it has sometimes been so. But there are several considerations even here. Firstly, the companions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) did not habitually resort to this practice unless there was a need for it, and, their power of memory being what it was, such a need arose only rarely.

---

[1] Hadith

2 Nowadays, a sect has come into existence; which has coined some principles of reason (*dirayat*) and applies the same principles to the traditions (Hadiths) and in case the application fails, it distorts the meaning of the tradition or denies it at all. It made the authority of reason so common that it believed the authority to be judge on Allah too. One should well understand that there is no authoritative power over Allah, despite accepting reason as authority. They say, the reason behind Hazrat Ibrahim's (AS) not burning in fire, does not come to their mind, therefore, Allah (swt) did not make it happen. It is quite surprising that something didn't take place because it didn't come into your mind! (Malfoozat- V. 28, P. 391-392)

[3] Only four situations are rationally possible in which there can be a contradiction between a rational argument and argument based on report. (see on page 36)

Secondly, the same tradition has often been heard and reported by a number of companions. If one of them has reported only the sense, another has reported the actual words. When the purport of two such reports is found to be identical, it shows us that even those who have reported the sense alone have understood the words quite correctly. In fact, the man who is scrupulous and has the fear of God, would take great care in trying to grasp the sense too, and would tremble with dread lest he should misinterpret it – he would to be satisfied unless he receives it without the slightest doubt or reservation.

If it should sometimes happen- though it is rare enough- that the words have not been preserved at all, even then it is evident that a man who is close to speaker and knows him intimately, can understand his speech in the light of the context, the situation, the tone and the accompanying gesture, as no one else ever can on this basis, the insight of companions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith must be as trustworthy as the understanding of them by others can never be.

This being so, how can it be proper on the part of the others to oppose them, to make uncalled for assertions supposedly on the basis of the Holy Qur'an or one’s own reasoning, and, taking these assertions to be the very dictates of reason, to reject a Hadith altogether as contrary to ‘reason’? Can such a way of looking at things be at all worthy of our attention?

In view of these considerations, if there can at all be room for a doubt to arise, the doubt can at the most be effective with regard to the authoritative degree of certain tradition[1] alone. In that case, the most that can happen is that such tradition would not be considered fit for establishing finally authoritative injunctions on them. But even approximative

[1] Hadith

injunctions are part and parcel of the Shariah, and it is obligatory to obey them. So, even the approximative nature of such injunctions would not be detrimental to their validity.

Intimation (6)

REGARDING *IJMA'*, OR THE CONSENSUS OF OPINION AS ONE OF THE SOURCES OF THE *SHARIAH*

We are now left with *'Ijma'* or the consensus of opinion on the part of the learned jurists of Islam, and *'Qiyas'*, or inference by analogy.

FIRST ERROR: NOT CONSIDERING CONSENSUS TO BE AN ARGUMENT OF SHARIAH

The usual error with regard to consensus is that it is not given a status higher than that of personal opinion, and hence it is not considered to be a valid ground for establishing an injunction as obligatory.

For one, this principle is derived from "sound report", and in this matter one has to depend on "report" (namely, the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith).[1] So, when we turn to the authority of "report", we find the following regulation: If the *Ulema* of a particular age come to agree upon a particular issue, their opinion is binding, whether it pertains to beliefs or to actions, and, in the presence of such a consensus, to follow one's personal opinion is to be misguided. This "report" and the argument derived from it have been discussed in detail in the books on the basic principles of the *Shariah*.[2]

---

[1] We have learnt the rule in Principle no. 2, that it is necessary to admit something, proved with an argument based on sound report.

2 Ibn 'Umar narrated that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: 'Indeed Allah will not gather my Ummah" - or he said: "(Muhammad's) Ummah upon deviation and Allah's Hand is over the Jama'ah, and whoever deviates, he deviates to the Fire." (Jami` at-Tirmidhi 2167)

Some issue of consensus and inference are those, attached to Hadith and The Quran, because consensus is achieved in two ways: (1) Consensus is achieved on an issue which has a hadith reported by one ... (on Page 88)

Just as, when a book of law is accepted as authoritative, all its articles are equally obligatory; in the way, as the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith enjoy the position of final authority, all the laws laid down in them must be treated as obligatory. And one of these laws is that consensus is a definitive argument. So, this law too must be obligatory, and denial of this law must amount to an opposition of the divine and the prophetic code itself. This is evident enough.

Had this principle not been based on sound report, even then the law of our natural reason would have compelled us to admit that in our affairs we prefer the opinion of the majority to individual opinion, and consider the latter to have no weight as against the former. How can consensus which, being the agreement of all opinions[1], carries still more weight than the majority opinion, be placed on the same level as individual opinion, or be superseded by it?

SECOND ERROR: CONSENSUS OF NEW MASTERS HAS NO VALID GROUND AGAINST THE CONSENSUS OF OLD MASTERS

Here a new objection may be raised to this effect-no doubt, individual opinion would not be able to hold its ground against consensus, but if we (of this age) come to agree upon something which is totally opposed to the consensus of the old masters, then our opinion can rightfully challenge consensus. The reply to this objection is that the agreement of every man is not valid in every sphere; the only agreement which can be

---

…(from Page 87) (2) The second consensus is that the issue was proved with inference and, then, consensus was achieved. In the first case, consensus attached to Hadith is clear and in the second case it is attached to the Book and Sunnah because the inference derived from the Book and Tradition (Hadith) alone is an argument. If the inference of an issue is derived from the Book, the consensus is attached to The Book, and if the inference is derived from the Tradition (Hadith), the consensus is attached with Tradition (Hadith). (Asharafut-Tafasir-V. 2, P. 27)

[1] Of *Ulema*

valid in a particular sphere is that of its experts. So, if we honestly compare ourselves with the early masters in the matter of religious rectitude, we shall find a great decline in our own case, as to knowledge and practice both. Our standing in relation to them will turn out to be exactly the same as that of amateurs in relation to experts. Thus, our agreement as against theirs would have the same worth as the agreement of amateurs as against that of experts- that is to say, it would be as ineffective. Of course, if there is something about which nothing has been reported from the early masters, in that case the agreement of the *Ulema* of our own day too will be trustworthy.

Apart from all these arguments, there is behind this distinction a secret law of nature as God has ordained it. The habitual way of Allah is that selfless and sincere work always receives divine help. While work motivated by personal desire does not. This fact being granted, we must try to understand that if we possess, with regard to a certain matter, the consensus of the early masters- and it has already been established that such consensus enjoys final authority, there is not religious need for us to exercise or personal judgement in face of it. If one still indulges in it unnecessarily, the action cannot but be motivated by personal desire, and hence it cannot receive divine help. On the other hand, if we do not possess such consensus with regard to a certain matter, then a religious need for exercise of personal judgement does arise. To do something in order to fulfil a religious need is a sign of selflessness, and selfless work always receives divine help. Hence, such an argument would be trustworthy for having been aided by Allah himself.

Let us make a necessary clarification at this stage. When we say that if we possess the consensus of the early masters with regard to a certain matter, the agreement of later *Ulema* (Islamic scholars) cannot be trustworthy as against it,

what we have in mind is only that kind of consensus which has been arrived at by the early masters on the basis of their own opinion. Let us add that even such an opinion must have had the sanction of the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith behind it, though no explicit and conclusive statement might be present in them.

On the other hand, if the consensus rests on the explicit connotation of a certain statement in the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith, then any kind of opposition to this consensus would amount to an opposition to this explicit statement in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith themselves.

One might now ask: supposing that there exists an explicit statement in the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith which contradicts a certain consensus based on another explicit statement, would it be permissible to go against the consensus which is in conformity with the latter? We would reply that even then it is not permissible. And we shall explain why. One explicit statement in the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith has as much value and validity as another. But one of them has acquired an additional force through conformity with the consensus. Now, to act upon a weak argument when a stronger one is also available, is to go against reason as well as tradition[1].

We would even add that an argument based on tradition[2] has already established that it is impossible for a matter which has been decided by consensus to be erroneous. So, if a statement in the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith supporting a consensus is not evident to us, and, on the other hand, a statement is there to contradict it, even then this consensus would be given precedence on the assumption that those who had arrived at this consensus must have had before them some such statement which has not been cited by them. We say so on the following grounds. It is an error to oppose a statement in

---

[1] Revelation
[2] Revelation

the Holy Qur'an or in the Hadith, and it is impossible for consensus to be erroneous. Hence it is impossible for this consensus to be opposed to such a statement. Therefore, the consensus must inevitably be in conformity with a statement. And the statement to which it conforms must be given precedence over another statement, because the former has been further strengthened by the consensus.

Consequently, even in this case, what has been given precedence over a statement in the Hadith is only another statement in the Hadith. And the relevant consensus is the sign and indication of the existence of the latter. In the Arabic terminology it is called *Al-dalil-al-inni.*

For example, consensus has forbidden the combining of two consecutive ritual prayers unless one is travelling or has a valid excuse. The Hadith which contradicts it can be found in *Tirmidhi*[1]. In the same way, consensus has forbidden the call for prayers (*Adhan*) at the time of (before) the false dawn, but a Hadith in *Tirmidhi*[2] apparently contradicts it.[3]

---

[1] The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) combined the noon and afternoon prayers, and the sunset and night prayers at Medina without any danger and rain. He was asked: What did he intend by it? He replied: He intended that his community might not fall into hardship. (Tirmidhi-187)

عَنْ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ قَالَ جَمَعَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَيْنَ الظُّهْرِ وَالْعَصْرِ وَبَيْنَ الْمَغْرِبِ وَالْعِشَاءِ بِالْمَدِينَةِ مِنْ غَيْرِ خَوْفٍ وَلَا مَطَرٍ قَالَ فَقِيلَ لِابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ مَا أَرَادَ بِذَلِكَ قَالَ أَرَادَ أَنْ لَا يُحْرِجَ أُمَّتَهُ (187)

[2] Talaq Ibn Ali reported that Allah's messenger (saw) said. "Eat and drink and do not let the rising light confuse you. Eat and drink till redness (of dawn) is apparent to you." (Tirmidhi- 705)

عن طَلْقُ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ كُلُوا وَاشْرَبُوا وَلَا يَهِيدَنَّكُمْ السَّاطِعُ الْمُصْعِدُ وَكُلُوا وَاشْرَبُوا حَتَّى يَعْتَرِضَ لَكُمْ الْأَحْمَرُ (705)

[3] In the original copy of Al-Intebahat, the very word 'waqt' (time) is written, but the author suggested to replace it with the word Qabl (before), because it creates confusion as it is allowed to eat and drink after the red dawn. (In Hallul-Intebahat, Hakim Muhammad Mustafa Bijnauri (ra) has given this clarification at this place.)

Intimation (7)

REGARDING *QIYAS* OR INFERENCE BY ANALOGY, AS A SOURCE OF THE *SHARIAH*

Having considered the three principles, we now have to deal only with *Qiyas*, or inference by analogy. The errors usually committed in this respect are quite a few.

FIRST ERROR IN UNDERSTANDING THE MEANING AND NATURE OF INFERENCE

The first of these errors pertains to the meaning and nature of inference by analogy. In substance, this principle is applicable only to a situation about which there is no explicit injunction either in the Holy Qur'an or in the Hadith, nor is there a consensus on the subject. But, evidently enough, there is no situation of this world or of the other that the *Shariah* could have neglected, and for which it should not have laid down an injunction- as we have shown under Intimation No. 3[1] while discussing the fourth error[2]. So, even in the case of those situations for which we do not find an explicit injunction, one would rather say that the *Shariah* has laid down an injunction for this situation too, but, since it has not been formulated in express and explicit terms, the relevant injunction is present in a veiled form. Thus, one will be required to deduce or infer this veiled injunction in some way.

The mode of this deduction too has been pointed out by certain indications in the *Shariah*. And it is this, in dealing with a situation about which the *Shariah* is apparently silent, one

---

[1] Intimation no 3 is regarding Prophethood.

[2] The fourth error is that the teachings and injunctions of a prophet are supposed to be exclusively concerned with the affairs of the other world, while in the affairs of this world, one is supposed to be absolutely independent of such injunctions.

should firstly consider those situations about which explicit injunctions have been laid down in the Holy Qur'an or the Hadith in order to find out which one of them has the nearest resemblance with or similarity to the situation under investigation with regard to its peculiarities and characteristics. Secondly, one should try to determine, in the case of the situation for which there is an explicit injunction, the peculiarity or characteristic which forms the most probable basis for this injunction. Thirdly, one should ascertain whether this very peculiarity is present in the case of that situation too about which the *Shariah* appears to be silent. Finally, if it is found to be present, the same injunction will be held to apply to this situation also as has been explicit laid down for the other situation analogous to this one.

Thus, the process of inference by analogy has to pass through four stages, and there are technical names for the different factors involved in it. The situation for which there is an explicit and regular injunction in the *Shariah* is called "*Maqees-alaih*" (that on which the analogy is based), while the situation about which the *Shariah* appears to be silent is "*Maqees*" (the analogue).

The basis of the injunction is "*Ilat*" (the basis of the analogy) and the final affirmation of this injunction for the situation about which the *Shariah* appears to be silent, is called "*Ta'diyah*" (extension) or "*Qiyas*" (Inference by Analogy).

This, then, is the real meaning and nature of inference by analogy, which the *Shariah* has sanctioned as has been amply shown by the writers on the basis principles of the *Shariah*.

Therefore, one must admit that even when an injunction has been established through inference by analogy, the real and ultimate sanction behind it is the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith,

and that inference by analogy does no more than make the injunction manifest.[1]

Now, as against this genuine inference by analogy, what is nowadays called "*Qiyas*" by Muslim modernists, and actually practiced by them, is something totally different. The substance of this new-fangled "Qiyas" is no more than individual and personal opinion, pure and simple, in which injunctions are not deduced from the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith in conformity with the procedure described above. Even they themselves admit this fact, for they are too fond of using phrases like "in our opinion" and "we think". This, in fact, amounts to setting oneself up as legislator laying down the *Shariah*. The defect of this approach is evident even from the rational point of view. Individual opinion has also been condemned by the Holy Qur'an, the Hadith and the early masters. This shows the falsity of this approach from the traditional point of view[2]. Thus, it is condemnable rationally as well as traditionally[3].

SECOND ERROR IN DETERMINING THE OCCASION OF INFERENCE BY ANALOGY

The second error pertains to the occasion when the principle of inference by analogy can be validly employed. The above discussion has made it clear that the need for inference arises only in those situations about which there is no explicit

---

[1] Those who are short-sighted, accuse the jurists of deriving inference by analogy despite having the texts, whereas it is totally wrong. They have clarified the inference by analogy makes the injunction manifest and does not sanction. It means the injunctions hidden in the texts and away from the common minds; the inference manifests them and does not sanction any separate meaning, but to derive the injunctions from the texts is not the job of each and every individual. Such kind of faculty had been bestowed upon the old masters. (Malfoozat- V.10, P. 232-233)

[2] According to revelation

[3] According to both reason and revelation

injunction in the *Shariah*, and that, in order to extend the application of a certain injunction intended for one situation to an analogous situation, one has to find out the *raison d'être* of this injunction. It follows from this that, unless there is an actual need for such an extension and inference, it is not permissible to seek to determine the *raison* d'être of an explicit injunction. The great error which is so often being committed nowadays is that people try to impute some kind of a *raison d'être* even to an explicit injunction without there being any need for it, and then venture to make the very existence or nonexistence of this injunction depend on the existence or nonexistence of this *raison d'être* which they imagine to have discovered- as we have already shown under Intimation No. 3[1], while discussing the sixth error[2].

THIRD ERROR IN THE MOTIVE OF INFERENCE

The second error with regard to inference helps us to understand the nature of the third error too, which pertains to the purpose of inference. As we have just explained, the essential purpose of inference is to extend and apply a certain injunction to a certain situation for which no injunction is to be found in the *Shariah* explicitly, and not to alter or distort one which has been explicitly laid down.

The fourth error pertains to the question as to who enjoys the authority to make an inference. The modernists consider everyone to be worthy of this right. Some bold spirits have propounded, in their public lectures, that the verse:

لَكُمْ دِيْنُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِيْن (القرآن)

"For you is your faith, and for me, my faith". (109:6)

---

[1] Intimation no 3 is "Regarding Prophethood".

[2] The sixth error is "inventing certain *raisons d'être* for injunctions on the basis of personal opinion".

has bestowed the right of drawing an inference in religious matters *(Ijtihad)* upon each and every one. As a matter of fact, the masters of the science of the basic principles of the *Shariah* have, with strong arguments, already laid down the qualifications necessary for the man who can be allowed the right to draw an inference for himself in religious matters *(Ijtihad).*This shows that it can never be a common or general right. Moreover, this particular verse of the Holy Qur'an does not at all mean what the modernists suppose it to mean. Then, it does not require a very fine intelligence to be able to see that every one cannot be worthy of this right. The substance of what we have said above about the nature of *Qiyas* and *ijtihad* in comparable to a lawyer applying a certain section of the legal code to a particular case if everyone were equally competent to do it, where would be the need for studying law and getting a degree? Just as, in the latter case, certain conditions must be fulfilled-the man should have studied law, he should still know and remember what he had once studied, he should have understood the aims and objectives of different laws, and he should have an insight into the intricacies of the cases he is dealing with before he can be regarded as qualified to advise that the case falls under such and such section of the legal code; in the same way similar conditions must be fulfilled in the matter of exercising *Ijtihad* also[1].

Now, it a different matter whether a man with the qualification necessary for *Ijtihad* can be found in our own day. This is a subject of controversy[2] between two Muslim sects- on the one hand are those who hold that it is necessary to conform to the decisions of the established masters of *fiqh* or Islamic

---

[1] The example of common man is as general citizens, and of scholars is as lawyers, and *Mujtahideen* are like the high court judges. When a common man cannot go against a high court judge, even an ordinary judge, how come the common people would be allowed to oppose *Ulema*? Since the law is what the parliament has formulated and its meaning is what the judges understand.

[2] Contention

law, and on the other hand are those who do not think so. It would be quite out of place for us to discuss the question at length, for we are here concerned only with those errors into which Muslim modernists have generally fallen. So, we would say only a few words on the subject. Supposing that a man with such qualifications can still be found, even then it is better to be on the safe side, and not to rely on one's own *Ijtihad* or Qiyas, for we who belong to the present age temperamentally tend to follow our own desires and to seek lame excuses even in religious matters. If we begin to exercise the right of *Ijihad*, it is almost certain that our minds will always be inclined towards that decision which suits our desires. Moreover, we would thus be providing an example to those who are totally unworthy of this privilege. Such people would use the precedent set by us as a pretext for appropriating the right of *Ijtihad* to themselves. And this would finally lead to a diminishing of piety, fear of God and scrupulousness on religious matters.

Let us take an example from everyday life. Once they have been assumed to be the most qualified judges of a high court have declared their judgement in a case, no one, not even a subordinate judge, is allowed to interpret the particular section of the legal code in a different way, and the basis of this injunctions is that they have been assumed to be the most qualified to interpret the law. Were we to allow everyone to go against the judges, everyone would act in his own way, and end up by destroying law and order in the country. We should try to see that exactly the same principle holds good with regard to the established masters of Islamic law.

Now, let us finally sum up the essential substance of all the errors regarding the fourfold sources of the *Shariah*:-

The modernists accept the Holy Qur'an as the final authority. They also accept its authenticity. But they commit errors in interpreting it.

They accept the Hadith as an authority, but question its authenticity, and do not thus touch upon the question of interpreting it.

They refuse altogether to accept *Ijma*, or consensus, as an authority.

In place of *'Qiyas* ", or inference by analogy, they have substituted an invention of their own, which they take to be the final criterion for judging the validity of an injunction. And the principle they have invented is personal opinion.

Intimation (8)

REGARDING THE REALITY OF THE ANGELS, THE JINNS AND SATAN

LACK OF OBSERVATION IS NO ARGUMENT FOR NON-EXISTENCE:

The modernists deny to the angels and the jinns that kind of existence which has been affirmed by the Holy Qur'an, the Hadith and the consensus, sometimes on the ground that if such substances did really exist, they must have been apprehensible through the senses, and sometimes on the ground that one cannot understand that nature of the existence of a thing which is supposed to pass before our eyes and yet remain unperceived. This, then, is that reason of their denial. But the Holy Qur'an categorically affirms the existence of the angels and the jinns in several verses, and a Muslim cannot question the authenticity of the Holy Qur'an. So, the modernists have recourse to such farfetched interpretations and rationalizations as amount to a clear distortion of the sense of those verses.

As to the grounds on which the explicit meanings of these verses are denied, we have already shown, under Principal No.4[1], why they are erroneous. This is our exhaustive reply to the objection.

ONE'S INABILITY TO UNDERSTAND SOMETHING IS NO ARGUMENT FOR ITS BEING FALSE

And now let us reply by a counter-charge. The philosophers believe that matter, before being invested which the existing forms, was in a subtle state which is described as nebulous or ethereal. Now, that is a substance too, but no one

[1] Principle no. 4 is "if a thing exists, it is not necessary that it must also be sensible and visible".

ever observed it. Moreover, its peculiar state and quality cannot be understood clearly except in a vague imaginary manner. That is why some of the Greeks have even denied its existence. Yet they assume its existence, simply because their argument required such an assumption, although this assumption is not itself founded upon any argument at all- as we have shown under Intimation No. 1[1].

Thus when, there is no rational argument to prove the impossibility of substances like the angels and the jinns, their existence must be posited as rationally possible. And when a thing is rationally possible and there is at the same time an argument based on sound report to establish its existence, it becomes rationally necessary to affirm its existence (vide Principle No. 2[2]). Moreover, it is the Holy Quran and the Hadith which report the existence of the angel and the jinns. So, it is doubly necessary and obligatory to affirm the existence of such substances.

And since fundamental principle with regard to the interpretation of the verses of the Holy Qur'an and the traditions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) is that they have to be taken, above all, in the literal and explicit sense, so it is erroneous to indulge in farfetched interpretations. Even a rational argument enjoys only the approximative degree of validity (vide Principle No. 7[3]), what then, can be the value of the idle fancies of these modernists?

Some of the modernists have raised certain other objections in this regard, which have been mentioned in Sir

---

[1] Intimation no 1 is regarding the temporality of matter.

[2] If a thing is rationally possible, and its existence is attested by sound report, then it is necessary to accept its existence.

[3] The argument based on report should be final, while the rational argument should be approximative. Here the report would certainly be given precedence over the other argument.

Syed Ahmad khan’s commentary on the Holy Quran. Those who are interested in the subject may see the replies in the book “*Alburhan*”. (See Imdadul-Fatawa V. 6 P. 264 to 324)

Intimation (9)

REGARDING THE EVENTS IN THE GRAVE, THE REALITIES OF THE OTHER WORLD, HEAVEN, HELL, THE BRIDGE OF *SIRAT*, THE BALANCE, ETC.

The modernists reject the explicit significations of all these things on the very same ground on which their denial of the actuality of the angels and the jinns is based. Since we have already demonstrated, under Intimation No. 8[1], how weak these grounds are, it also goes to show the nullity of such a rejection.

IMPROBABILITY DOES NOT IMPLY IMPOSSIBILITY

Some people have raised other objections too. But quite a few of these are to be found even in writings of the old *Mu'tazilah* school, and have already been conclusively refuted in the books of '*Ilm-ul-kalam*', while others are nowadays being presented in a somewhat new form. But all of them can be summarised like this: when the soul of a dead man lying in the grave is no longer present in his body, how can he be conscious of pain or pleasure? How can he hear the questions of the interrogating angels without possessing the sense of hearing, and make a reply without possessing the faculty of speech?[2] Where are Heaven and Hell located? If they are really

[1] Regarding the reality of the angels, the jinns and Satan (the Holy Qur'an categorically affirms the existence of the angels and the jinns in several verses)

[2] Such things are not at all discovered with only mind and reason. Allah Ta'ala has given different faculties to human being. If one sense would have been doing all, what was the need to give so many senses as a sense is attached with eyes, one is with ears and another one is related with nose. So, human being has different kinds of senses. It is, therefore, a sense of revelation required for the spirits to see in the graves. If a man having no sense of revelation calls it unjust, he is wrong. A chain of a large number of messengers and millions of pious people, who passed in this world, and a number of religious men doing spiritual exercises are the living examples of this fact. No matter, we can or cannot completely discover … (on page 103)

as vast as they are reported to be, which space can accommodate then?[1] If the *Bridge of Sirat* is so narrow, how can one possibly walk on it? Human deeds not being physical bodies, how would they be placed in the *Balance*?[2]

… (from page 102) the nature of its relation and the hidden reason but the relation itself cannot be denied. However, the arguments of revelation are making everything clear, though, the mind is not able to perceive it such as ears have no defect if they are not able to see things as seeing is the job of other faculty.

Fire and greenery of grave are not of the kind of worldly fire and not similar to the field and greenery of the world which could be perceived by seeing. It is the kind of the fire and greenery of the hereafter and the people in the world cannot perceive it. And it is because the wisdom of faith of unseen remains intact. It is, therefore, quite possible that two people are buried side by side and have different deeds, one might be burning in hell-fire and heat could not reach the person lying beside and the second one might be lying in the garden of heaven and the person nearby cannot benefit from the luxury and comfort. It is from the divine talismans and Allah Almighty is Omnipotent.

[1] Where are Paradise and Hell? This question as per reason is not worthy to be listened to. For a thing to exist, it is not necessary to be known to us. In this universe itself, there are thousands of places and things not known to us. How we can say it impossible, if paradise and hell are in this universe and yet not known to us. It is not impossible too if they are out of the ranges of the heaven and earth. Both the cases by reason are possible but the (scriptural) texts prove them to be out of the ambit of the heaven and earth. (Al-Masalihul Aqliyyah- p. 372)

[2] Balance: On the day of judgement, effect of the deeds will take form and be visible to the people of resurrection. For example, a thief who has committed a theft will appear there to be stealing. One who has committed adultery will appear to be committing adultery there. In short, the effects of deeds preserved in his body will appear all in the shapes of deeds there. This verse “Thus they will find what they did all there” (Surah Kahf V. 49) says the same thing. The relation the mind has with outside, we say, the same relation this world has with the hereafter. Such as the things in mind are substances outside, similarly, there is no doubt if the things are substances in the world hereafter. (Ashrafust-Tafaseer-V.3, P. 16-17, Malfoozat-e-Kamalat-e-Ashrafiyah V. 23, P. 96)

The single reply to all these questions is this; the essence of all these objections is improbability, but what is improbable is not necessarily impossible (vide Principle No. 3[1]). Impossibility having been discounted, all these things become rationally possible. Now, trustworthy report- namely, the Holy Qur'an and Hadith- affirms that they are real and actual. Hence, it is necessary to accept them as real and actual (vide Principle No.2[2]).

We shall now provide specific replies to the different questions individually.

It is quite possible that the human body in the grave should possess so much of soul as be conscious of pain and pleasure, but not affected by the stimulant of this world nor be moved by those of the intermediary world.

For instance, a man once reported his experience to me. He was being treated for the retention of urine, and had been anaesthetised. As the catheter was inserted, he did not feel any pain whatsoever, but he did experience uneasiness on account of a sort of suffocation, and was unable to move.

Alternatively, it is also possible that the pain or the pleasure is not experienced by the body in the grave but by the soul in the abode where it happens to reside.

As to where the soul does reside, it is possible that this abode lies in some part of the vaster space, and that this may be the sphere known as "the world of spirits".

This possibility disposes of the objection as to how a body can be tortured (or comforted) if it has been burnt or eaten up by a beast.

---

[1] What is rationally impossible is something totally different from what is merely improbable. The impossible is opposed to reason itself, while the improbable is opposed merely to habit.

[2] If a thing is rationally possible, and its existence is attested by sound report, then it is necessary to accept its existence. On the other hand if its non-existence is attested by sound report, then it is equally necessary to accept its non-existence

As to how one can hear without ears or speak without a tongue, we would firstly say that these organs are not rationally necessary for the act of perception, but only the habitual conditions. The two categories have distinct characteristics (vide Principle No.3[1]). It is just possible that what is habitual for that world is different from what is habitual for this one. Secondly, it is equally possible that in the world beyond the grave the soul receives a different kind of body which is appropriate to that world, and which has similar organs of perception. In fact certain men of mystic vision (ahl-al-kashf) do believe in such a state, and call it "the subtle body[2]" (al-jism-al-mithali).

As for the location of heaven and hell, it is possible that they lie somewhere in the vaster space, which is supposed to be unlimited by modern thinkers. Crossing the bridge of *Sirat* might well appear to be improbable with regard to our present situation, but it does not make it necessarily impossible (vide Principle No.3[3]).

The weighing of human deeds in the balance too is possible in the following manner. Every human deed is recorded in books, and these are bodies, according to the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith. So, it is possible that every meritorious deed is written down in a particular part of the book, and as the number of such parts increases, the weight too would undoubtedly increase. Moreover, it is possible that some of these parts may in spite of the equivalence in mass differ in lightness or heaviness on accounts of accidental qualities like

---

[1]What is rationally impossible is something totally different from what is merely improbable. The impossible is opposed to reason itself, while the improbable is opposed merely to habit.

[2] The imaginal body

[3] What is rationally impossible is something totally different from what is merely improbable. The impossible is opposed to reason itself, while the improbable is opposed merely to habit.

sincerity etc. For example, we find heat and cold make a different in the weight of bodies which are equivalent in mass and nature. This might be the case with evil deeds too. Thus, these books would be weighed in the *Balance*, and the differences in the weights would, no doubt, reveal the differences amongst the deeds. Even the traditions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) suggest that this probability is closer to the truth, for the terms like *Bitaqah* (piece of paper) and "Sijillat" (scrolls) are explicit enough. Thus, we see that the weighing of scroll is something real and actual, but is has metaphorically been attributed to deeds. So where is the harm if things happen on the same pattern even in the other world?

The objection with regard to the ability of the bodily organs to speak is of the same nature. It is merely a habitual improbability, and not a rational impossibility. In fact, since the appearance of the gramophone there is little justification left for describing the ability of the bodily organs to speak even as improbable.

Intimation (10)

REGARDING CERTAIN FEATURES OF THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE

As we have already explained in our introductory remarks, it is not one of the basic objects of the sacred *Shariah* to discuss the physical universe, but the *Shariah* has touched upon certain topics of this nature in a subsidiary manner as an aid to the attainment of its own proper object. So, it is not necessary for us to investigate fully into the nature and properties of the universe, for such an enquiry has little to do with the basic purpose of the *Shariah*. All the same, to whatever extent and in whatever way, the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith have said something on the subject, it is not permissible to affirm or to believe in what is opposed to such statements. Since these statements occur in the "truthful utterance" to affirm the opposite amounts to denying the "truthful utterance". Hence, we must consider it rationally incumbent upon us to deny and to reject all such beliefs or propositions as are contrary to the statements in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith.[1]

---

[1] Basically it should be kept in mind that the purpose of Shariah is the guidance of people towards the cognition of the Creator and the relation of people should be restored with the Creator. Likewise, it is meant to explain the mode of worship and the commandments which establish the system of living and make the hereafter better. The subjects of cosmology and mode of creation of the world are not the purpose of Shariah, but in general they found their mention as much as they required in achieving the goal such as the creation of heaven and earth, bringing them into being from nothing, nature of difference and system in variety of creatures, so as the rational arguments upon existence of God and the Creator could be established for the people.

Now it should be understood that the religious arguments do not deny the established facts in science and philosophy because there can never be a contradiction between two definite arguments. And the things mentioned in Shariah such as: the existence of seven heavens and earths, all creatures are perishable, stars and planets are in heaven, being the creation of all kinds of the worlds independently not as splitting or evolutionary; no definite arguments shall be established to negate these things till the last day.

CREATION OF THE FIRST MAN:

It would not be out of place to mention a few of such cases by way of example to serve as a pattern. The first among these is the explicit statement in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith that first man (Adam) is born out of clay. Now, to posit, on the basis of the theory of evolution that a beast has by stages developed into the present form of men, as Darwin has fancied, would certainly be false. For the statements in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith explicitly go against such a hypothesis, and there is no rational argument which should contradict these statements. Neither does Darwin possess such an argument, for the himself has confessed that he has produced a theory as a result of his own speculations: nor do his followers from among the Muslims, for their own statements show that they affirm this theory only in imitation of Darwin. In fact, if one reflects a little, one would find that even their imitation of Darwin is imperfect, both in respect of the motivating cause and in respect of the particular detail. In respect of the motivating cause, for what impelled Darwin to affirm such a ridiculous hypothesis was the fact that, being a materialist and an unbeliever, he could not have faith in religion, and had to invent the cult of evolution. Thus it became necessary for him to ascribe some physical cause or condition to the appearance of everything, and hence he posited this probability with regard to the birth of man. But as for those who believe in the existence of the creator-that is to say, people belonging to different religions, and specially Muslims, they have no need for any cult of evolution at all; profession of faith in Divine creation is sufficient for them; they can easily affirm that man was created by God, and that he was created in the present form. Then, why should they need to posit such a ridiculous proposition? This goes to show that Muslims are not in agreement in denial of the Creator which compelled Darwin to proceed in this manner. That is why we say that modernist

Muslims are not really following him with regard to the very *raison d'être* of the theory of evolution.

In respect of particular details too, their imitation of Darwin is imperfect. Darwin does, no doubt, posit that a species of beast evolved by stages into man, but he does not affirm it in the case of a single individual, nor does he have any natural need to make such an affirmation. On the contrary, he posits that in the course of evolution when beastly nature acquired the potentiality to become man, a large number of individuals belonging to the same beastly species turned into the human species all at time. But Muslim, so long as they are Muslims, cannot accept such a hypothesis, for the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith explicitly state that the first man was a single individual. So, they cannot be in agreement with Darwin even in respect of this particular detail. We might remark that in our days certain insolent, unscrupulous and impudent people have had the temerity to suggest that Adam is the name of the ape which first turned into man. May Allah protect us from such things! Apart from the obvious impertinence of this suggestion, the pity is that such people have, in spite of their insolence, failed to attain the merit of being in perfect agreement with Darwin. They are neither here nor there.[1]

---

[1] Scientists believe all kinds of heavenly and earthly creation of the entire universe came into existence as (result of) splitting and evolution. The first constituent of all these is albumen which is composed with many solid and liquid elements. It has the qualities of nutrition, division and reproduction. This substance known as albumen is called protoplasm. With constant evolution and reproduction, the final and simple shape of plant, then other plants from it, similarly animals and then from animals, human being came into being. And this evolution led to the following things:

(1) Dissimilarity of individuals: Individuals virtually do not have similarity with each other. This dissimilarity caused the birth of male and female categories.

(2) Dispute for survival between individuals: Strong individuals survive and weak and feeble ones perish.

(3) Natural adoption: Nature adopts the shape which it thinks to be the best and complete. … (on page 110)

Among similar cases is the production of rain, lightning and thunder. The manner in which they are produced is mentioned in the traditions of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him). It is not permissible to deny it merely on the ground that people have, with the help of certain instruments, observed them being produced in a different manner. We call it impermissible, because had there been a contradiction between the two, then, of course, the affirmation of the manner to which our observation compelled us must have necessarily entailed the denial of the other. But there is no argument to show that there is a contradiction. It is quite possible that rain etc. are produced sometimes by one set of causes, and sometimes by another. Nor do the traditions claim to lay down a general affirmative proposition that admits of no exception or alternative. And as for observation it can never yield a law of this kind. Thus, in both the places we obtain merely partial propositions, or neutral ones, which have the force of a partial proposition. And it is a well known and accepted principle of

---

… (from page 109) About these things, Maulana Thanvi says: As far as the issue of offshoots of being dissimilar in the features of principles is concerned, it is applicable not only in plants and zoo, not in principles and offshoots but in all the creations which is the manifestation of the power of Allah, so as to distinguish and differentiate between the individuals of all species could be possible. It is because; creating doubt there would have been a disturbance in the system of the world, if the individuals of all species had been with the same appearance. And what is natural adoption is called is quite possible that Allah Ta'ala first created low and week creature, then, instead of splitting week and feeble creature He separately created the stronger and higher creature and wherewith no chance of survival dispute arose for the stronger with the week. He, then, might have separately created the higher and superior creature to that one and this is how the chain might have continued till all the present species came into existence. In such case, the theory of evolution rationally becomes doubtful and the theory of creation becomes acceptable with the help of literal meanings of the (scriptural) texts. Therefore, when the theory of evolution remained unsubstantiated, the foundation of splitting human being and ape from one origin can be placed on this theory.

logic that there can be no contradiction between two partial propositions. Hence, there being no contradiction between the two partial propositions, it is possible to accept both at the same time. Where, then, is the need to deny the traditions[1]?[2]

CAUSES OF PLAGUE

Similar is the case of the causes of plague which the traditions ascribe to sins or to the pricking by jinns. Even this statement does not come into contradiction with the observation which shows plague to be caused by a given particular kind of germs (Yersinia pestis). The explanation we have just given would hold good even here[3].

INFECTION OF DISEASE

Similarly, there is the traditional[4] belief that diseases are not contagious, which people nowadays deny on the ground of experimentation. If one reflects a little, one would see that even here there is no contradiction, for the rejection of the idea of contagion may mean that contagion is not something so necessary that it must always occur without fail and is an effective agent in itself without the sanction of the

---

[1] Hadiths

[2] The verse of the Holy Quran: "And We sent forth winds, loaded then sent down water from the sky and gave it to you to drink... (Al-Hijr V. 22) in this verse, what is said the winds fill the cloud with water is in respect of the wind that conveys the vapours of cloud to the point of severe frost wherein essence takes place. So, the wind became the cause of creating essence in the cloud. Moreover, the verse, "then sent down water from sky," can be justified as some water had been produced there, then, as per divine nature, water from sky too might have been occasionally or regularly sent for assistance. In this justification, these verses did not remain at all in contradiction to the observations and experiments. It should be well understood. (Bayanul Quran P 14, Al-Hijr)

[3] The author says, "There is no contradiction between the two causes of plague (yersinia pestis and poking of Jinn). One was discovered by the scientists and the other cause was informed by the Hadith and plague may be the result of both the causes."

[4]Scriptural

Creator.[1] Observation does not establish the existence of such a contagion. Conversely, observation shows us that sometimes contagion does not take place. On the other hand, the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith expressly lay down that everything depends on the will of God[2].

PLURALITY OF THE EARTH

Another case is the plurality of the earth, which has been specifically mentioned in the traditions[3]. It is not permissible to deny it merely on the ground that such a thing has not yet been discovered through observation, for the non-existence of observation does not necessarily imply the observation of nonexistence, and in this case one can advance only the latter as an argument not the former. Now, one may raise the objection that, according to the Traditions[4], the other earths lie under our earth, but one had gone round the globe in all directions without finding any trace of them. To this we would reply that those earths possibly somewhere in the vaster space so far away from our earth that one cannot see them. Or that they appear to be so small that we take them to be stars. As for their being underneath our earth, it may be so only with regard to certain situations and certain occasions, otherwise, with a change in the respective positions, they may sometimes be above the earth and sometimes underneath.

EXISTENCE OF YAJUJ AND MAJUJ

---

[1] Scientists believe that disease itself is an effective agent of infection. The Hadith (لاعدوی) denies it. However, where there is an order of Allah for infection, it occurs.

[2] قُلْ لَّآ اَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِيْ نَفْعًا وَّ لَا ضَرًّا اِلَّا مَا شَآءَ اللّٰه ﴿القران﴾ (Say, I have no power to bring a benefit or a harm to myself, except that which Allah wills.) 7-188

[3] Hadiths

[4] Hadiths

Still another case is the existence of *Yajuj* and *Majuj* (Gog and Magog). Here too one advances the lack of observation as an argument. But, as we have seen above, it is not a valid argument. It is possible that they reside near the pole which has not yet been discovered, or in some big island which has not yet been explored.

PLURALITY OF HEAVEN AND HAVING HARD BODY

Similar is the case of the belief that the heavens are plural in number, and have a hard body. Here too we refer back to the principle (4) that the lack of observation is not a valid argument.[1]

MOTION OF CERTAIN PLANETS

Another case in the motion of certain planets, like the sun and the moon to which the Holy Qur'an ascribes movement, such motion has explicitly been attributed to them as being real and not as a mere visual illusion. In saying so we mean to deny that the sun is in a state of rest, and not to deny the motion of the earth. As for the latter, the *Shariah* has not discussed the matter at all, either affirmative or negatively. It is just possible that both of them possess a certain kind of motion,

---

[1] There is an explanation about the plurality of heavens in the Holy Quran. Allah Ta'ala says in surah Al-Mulk: (who has created seven skies (heavens), one over the other.) As it is in Hadith that above first heaven, there is the second one with a long distance, then the third one above it and so on and so forth. In the next verse, Allah talks about the stability of the heavens that you would not find any inconsistency in the creation of the Rahman. So, again return your vision to the sky, do you see any breaks (rifts)? (i.e. no doubt you might have seen it again and again but now you see it with deep concentration) then cast your eye again and again, and (finally) the eye will come back to you abased in a state of weariness. (And there will be nothing out of proportion i.e. He can create the thing as He wishes. He, therefore, wished to create the heavens firm and after the passage of time there are no breaks (rifts) in it and it is like the same saying of Allah, "And it has no cracks.Ch.50, V. 6) Bayanul Quran Surah Al-Mulk)

peculiar to each and that the combination of the two kinds of motion produces the configurations which we observe.[1]

SUN RISING IN THE WEST

There is also the case of such an alteration in the present system of the solar movement that on doomsday[2] it will dawn in the west instead of in the east. The mere fact that this system has always been observed to function in the present manner cannot serve as an argument to prove the impossibility of any change, as has sufficiently been demonstrated in rational sciences. It is self-evident that what is perpetual is not therefore necessary. Now, should one raise the objection that such an alteration goes against the law of nature, we have already clarified the point under Intimation No 2[3].

BODILY CELESTIAL ASCENSION

Then, there is the case of the possibility of the human body being elevated to a region which does not contain any air. Nowadays people deny it merely on the ground that it is not natural for man to remain alive in such a place. And, as a corollary, follows the denial of the bodily ascension of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) or *Miraj* (Celestial

---

[1] The Holy Qur'an says: "And He is the One who has created the night and the day, and the sun and the moon, each floating in an orbit" (21:33). The explicit sense of verse establishes the fact the sun moves from one position to another. On the other hand, certain scientists believe that the sun only rotates on its axis. But there is no final rational argument to establish this contention. So, it will be rationally necessary to reject this opinion, and to affirm that the sun moves from one position to another (translational motion).

[2] Before the onset of doomsday

[3] Intimation no. 2 is: "Regarding the Omnipotence of Allah" and the clarification is that the conclusion of going against the law of nature is the method of induction. But, in employing this method, one observes only a few particulars out of many, and if we apply a general conclusion based on the observation of a few particulars to other particulars also, such a procedure cannot give us a certain proof.

Ascension).In as much as it is supposed to go against the law of nature, one may see the reply to this objection under Intimation No. 2. Moreover, if one extends the rational probability a little, one need not call it even unnatural. For, it is not habitual for a man to remain alive in such a region only when he stays there for a considerable time, but if he passes through it with a swift movement like that of lightning, it would not be unnatural for him to remain alive in such a region. We daily observe that if we keep our finger in the fire for some time, it gets burnt, but we move it in and out of fire swiftly, it remains unscathed, in spite of having entered it. In the same way, if the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) during his ascension is believed to have been carried swiftly across the airless region to a higher one where air or some other element with similar properties existed in the space or sky, would that really be inadmissible?[1]

---

[1] A person asked me whether the celestial ascension of the Prophet was physical or spiritual journey to the heavens. I answered it was physical. He demanded the proof. I recited the verse, "Pure is He Who made His servant travel at night from *Al-Masjid Al-Haram* to *Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa*."(Ch.17-1) "And indeed he (Muhammad) saw him (Jibra'il) another time by *Sidrat-al-Muntaha* (the lote-tree in the upper realm)". (Ch. 53 V. 12-13). He asked if it was possible to cross a region where there was no air. I replied in yes. He again demanded the proof. I said, "Possibility is a name of non-obligation and non-impossibility. When there is no obligation and impossibility, possibility would be proved and when possibility is the fact, the claimant of impossibility or obligation is responsible to produce the proof. We are clinging to the fact and are not responsible for proof." He asked if anyone else had gone there. I said to him it was a demand of precedent, not a proof and producing precedent is on head of the claimant. Apart from this, it would also be an event and would require a precedent to an endless extent. So, it would necessitate a consecution which is impossible. And if you accept a precedent as an event without any precedent, why don't you accept this event itself without a precedent. He said to me it was impossible. I said to him it was improbable, not impossible and occurrence of improbable is possible supernaturally and impossible is something totally different from what improbable. (Malfoozat V. 12, Maqalaat-e-Hikmat V.1, Part 1, Page 83-84) …. (on Page 116)

Intimation (11)

REGARDING THE QUESTION OF DESTINY

This question ultimately leads us back to Divine knowledge and the power of Divine will. Anyone who believes in God and in the perfection of His attributes must also necessarily believe in Destiny.

DENIAL OF DESTINY

FIRST ERROR: But nowadays several grave errors are being committed on this subject. There are some who flatly deny it, and the basis of this denial is their apprehension that the affirmation of destiny entails the repudiation of human freedom, and that the abrogation of human will produces demoralization and degeneration. In fact, this apprehension itself is false. If someone with a distorted mind comes to regard human will as wanting in reality and efficacy, the fault does not lie in the belief in destiny. For, the Holy Quran and Hadith have nowhere denied the reality of human freedom. On the contrary, there are numerous explicit statements in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith which encourage human effort and struggle, and induce men to work for their livelihood, to carry provisions in their journey, and to take steps in order to defend oneself against harm or against the machinations of the *foe*. The difficulty as to whether medicine or prayer can ward off one's destiny has been solved in certain traditions[1] of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) in a wonderfully succinct and satisfying manner in the following words:

… (from Page 115) Allah Ta'ala used the people for the job, they themselves became speechless with but despite all these facts they refuse His powers. They get convinced if something comes into their experiment but refuse what Islam says though it is the precedent of their experiment. (Malfoozat Hakimul Ummat, Al-ifazat Alyaumiyyah V. 8 P. 121-122)

[1] Hadiths

ذالك من القدر كله (الحديث[1])

"One's act of praying and using medicine is also a part of one's destiny."

ALTERING THE INTERPRETATION OF DESTINY:

SECOND ERROR: There are still other modernist Muslims who have not, in view of the explicit statements in the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith ventured to deny Destiny, but apprehending that this belief would necessarily imply that man has no freedom of will and choice, which goes against one's observation, they have given the belief a new interpretation. Destiny, they say, is another name for divine knowledge, and since the knowledge of a fact does not determine the fact, the relationship between destiny and human action does not necessarily raise the difficulty mentioned above. To illustrate their meaning, they cite the case of the astrologer who can foresee and foretell future event; thus, if he foretells that such man would get drowned in a well on such a date, and it actually turns out to like that, we would not say that the man has been murdered by the astrologer. But one who is familiar with the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith may very well raise an objection here, and it would be a rational proposition too. Just as there is no event which should be unrelated to Divine Will and this is essential nature of Destiny. Even if a man does not choose to call it Destiny, he cannot deny the relationship between Divine Will and events. So, how does the modernist interpretation of Destiny help in avoiding the difficulty?

NEGATIVE REPLY OF THE ERROR:

---

1. Abu Khizamah reported on the authority of his father that a man came to the Prophet (Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam) and submitted, “about the Ruqyah that we blow (over the patient), the medicine that we take and the preventive measures that we adopt do they avert destiny in anyway whatsoever?” he said, “They are the part of Allah’s decree.”(Tirmidhi H. no. 1255)

As a matter of fact, the very proposition that the impossibility of everything going against Divine Will necessarily negates the freedom of human choice is in itself wrong. We may now offer two refutations of this proposition, one negative and the other positive. The negative reply is that if the impossibility of anything going against Divine Will negates the freedom of choice, and since Divine Will is evidently related even to Divine Acts themselves, it follows necessarily that God Himself should have no freedom of choice in the matter of His own acts. But no sane person can accept such a proposition.

POSITIVE REPLY OF THE ERROR:

And the positive reply, which is really the heart of matter, is that the will of the Creator is related to the acts of the creatures not merely with regard to their actualization, but also with a certain condition attached there to, the condition being actualization according to their choice. Thus, when the relationships between Divine Will and human choice with which it is related makes the latter a necessary entity, the belief in Destiny, far from negating human freedom, affirms and emphasizes it. This is so evident that one need not expatiate upon it.

As for the objection that one too often observes that those who believe in Destiny suspend all activities and just sit idle and helpless, we would reply that this is the consequence of their indolence, and not of the belief. Had this been the logical result of this belief, the companion of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) would have been the idlest of all people. In fact, a little reflection would show that the natural consequence of this belief is that one is encouraged to start one's effort, even when one's own plan or power seems to be very feeble. For instance, the companions looked towards Allah in all circumstances, and could hence take the greatest risks

fearlessly in spite of having no material means, for they resigned themselves to the Will of Allah. This is the very theme of the following verse of the Holy Qur'an:

كَمْ مِّنْ فِئَةٍ قَلِيْلَةٍ غَلَبَتْ فِئَةً كَثِيْرَةً بِاِذْنِ اللّٰهِ وَ اللّٰهُ مَعَ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ (القرآن)

"How many small groups have overcome large groups by the will of Allah. And Allah is with (those who remain) patient". (2.249)

And a Tradition[1] tells the following story in detail. A man brought his case for judgement before the Holy Prophet (peace be on him).Having lost the case, he said:

حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل

"Allah is sufficient for me, and He is the best disposer of affairs".
Hearing this, the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) remarked:

إن الله يلوم علي العجز فإذا غلبلك أمر فقل حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل (الحديث[2])

"Allah, Most High, blames for falling short, and when the matter gets the better of you, say; for me Allah is sufficient, and He is the best disposer of affairs".

The consequence which necessarily follows upon the belief in Destiny is that one who believes in it would not consider his own device to be really efficacious. And this is the conclusion to which sound rational argument must lead and which is also supported by an argument based on sound report. Then, how can it be a matter for reproach? On the contrary, the man who really deserves to be reproached is he who believes in the

[1] Hadith
2. Narrated Awf ibn Malik: The Holy Prophet (saw) gave a decision between two men, and the one against whom the decision was given turned away and said: For me Allah is sufficient, and He is the best dispenser of affairs. The Holy Prophet (saw) said: Allah, Most High, blames for falling short, but apply intelligence, and when the matter gets the better of you, say; for me Allah is sufficient, and He is the best disposer of affairs. (Abu Dawood H. 3627)

opposite. The man who believes in Destiny would consider human effort to be just as efficacious as a red flag is in stopping a train, which act is neither totally ineffective nor really efficacious by itself. The watchman who wants to stop a train at the time of danger would certainly adopt the device of waving the red flag, but he would all the time be looking towards the engine driver or the guard, relying on them and not on his own effort. As a Persian poet says:

"The scattering of musk–like fragrance is really the function of thy locks. But the lovers, as a matter of policy, impute it to the musk-deers of China".

REPLY TO A DOUBT:

One last question remains to be answered. When the belief in Destiny can be firmly established on the basis of rational argument and tradition[1] both, then why is all investigation into this matter said to be prohibited by the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)[2]? The reason for this prohibition is that certain doubts are not rational but natural (temperamental). Mere rational argument is not always sufficient in order to cure a man of such doubts. What is required in this case is that the intuitive faculty should be sound. Since people with a sound intuitive faculty are very few, an investigation into the problem of Destiny is quite likely to intensify such doubts, which would be disastrous for the life of this world and of that world both. So, the Holy Prophet (peace be on him), in his wisdom and benevolence, thought fit to

---

[1] Revelation

[2.] Abu Hurairah narrated: "The Messenger of Allah (saw) came out to us while we were discussing about Al-Qadar. He became angry such that his face became red, as if a pomegranate was bursting through his cheeks. He said: 'Is this what I ordered you to do?' The people before you were only ruined when they differed about this matter. I order you not to debate about it.' (Tirmidhi H. 2133)

prohibit this kind of enquiry[1], just as a kind-hearted physician prohibits a weak patient to take strong food.

---

[1] According to both reason and revelation, the fact of destiny traditionally and rationally is clear enough and that is the eternal knowledge and will to be attached with perishables which is proved rationally too and has no scope either to deny or doubt it. The same knowledge and will is attached with two kinds of things: (1) the things which are literally and as per Shariah called volitional and (2) the things which are called non-volitional. This volitional is also so obvious that even animals are in the know of it. Therefore, if anyone hits a dog with a stick, it attacks the person who hits it, not the stick. So, he is able to differentiate between the authorised and disabled. Moreover, a person who denies the volition finds anger in himself at the same time when he denies the speech of volition in man, if his servant spoils a job as he was he was able to avoid loss with his will power but he did not used it. So, its essence is so clear but if it is thought thoroughly it would become theoretical. Shariah, therefore, tenderly made it obligatory to believe in it and prohibited to ponder over it. It was a simple explanation. Now, I quote two student-like replies here so that the scholars may enjoy it. One of the replies is positive and investigative and other one is negative. The positive reply is given as: Though, destiny and divine will is attached with the actions of people and the effect of this attachment is so, that nothing could take place against destiny but despite this attachment, the will power and volition of a man cannot be denied because that attachment is in the form that a man would carry out a job at a time with his own will and power, now the destiny would be attached with the power and will of the doer as it is attached with the job. If the attachment of destiny caused the action to take place, the same attachment will cause the existence of power and will. So, instead of negating, the power of slave is more confirmed with the issue of destiny. There is no question then of accusing the slave of having no power and will. The negative reply is given as: No believer has a slightest doubt in Allah of being full authority and power and as the actions of slaves are destined, similarly the actions of Allah too are destined that Allah Ta'ala would create Zaid and will give him death at some particular time. If the doer becomes powerless because of the action destined, it will then cause Allah to become powerless (we seek refuge with Allah). Can any Muslim believe such thing? (Risalah Tulu-ul-Badr fi-Sutuil Qadr p. 9) In short, this natural and obvious issue is proved rationally and traditionally according to both reason and revelation and therefore becomes necessary to believe it. Since, contemplating over this issue causes doubts which are unlikely to be resolved and has no fruitful results too. It has been, therefore, …(on page 122)

Intimation (12)

Regarding the "Pillars of Islam" and the Modes of Worship

Some people are nowadays committing a great error with regard to the "pillars of Islam" and the modes of worship. They do not consider these injunctions to be ends in themselves, but try, on the basis of personal opinion, to discover some *raisons d'être* for each one of them, and take these *raisons d'être* to be the proper end. If these latter ends can be attained in some other way, they would not consider the respective injunctions to be at all necessary. For example, the *raison d'être* for ritual prayer is supposed to be moral discipline;[1]that for ritual ablution mere cleanliness;[2] that for fasting, control over animal energy;[3] that for ritual alms-giving

---

… (from page 121) prohibited by the prophet to discuss about destiny and because of being harmful it will rationally be prohibited too. (Ashraful-Jawab)

[1] Today, people are running after the raisons d'être which is very dangerous. For instance, people say Salah (prayer) in congregation is meant for unity. Thus, if this objective is achieved through some other means, people will leave Salah because the objective is achieved and Salah will have no importance. People have made the religion fun and game. Whatever comes to their mind, express it and do not think about its repercussions. (Malfoozat V. 2 P. 346)

[2] Ablution for mere cleanliness: to whatever extent, we will explain the raisons d'être and wisdoms of ablution, all are found in it but many other raisons d'être not known to us are found in it and in some other commandments. But determination of raison d'être, where not prescribed, would be conjectural. Therefore, if sometime this raison d'être comes under doubt, the commandment of Allah also will be considered doubtful. It would be a safer way to say that there are indeed raison d'être in the commandments but where the lawgiver did not determine it, we too avoid it and should continue to practice it with a view to obeying Allah Ta'ala. (Malfoozat V.23 P. 119, V.12 P. 115)

[3] No one can go free saying that fasting is meant for cultivating the soul and we are already cultivated. First of all, it is wrong to say that we are cultivated, and secondly cultivating the soul is the wisdom of fasting (sawm), not raison d'être. (Ashrafut-Tafaseer V.2 P.319)

(*zakat*), helping those who do not possess the means of "progress", that for the pilgrimage to Mecca (*Hajj*), collective gathering for the furtherance of trade, commerce, culture and for encouraging "progress", that for the recitation of the Holy Quran mere information and acquaintance with the contents of the book;[1] that for devotional prayer, only the satisfaction of the soul,[2] that for openly declaring (superiority of) the word (Islam) of Allah[3], mere peace and freedom.[1]These *raisons*

---

[1] Recitation of the Quran: the motive behind not paying heed towards recitation of the Quran is an ill-belief. It means, taking recitation of words as a useless and meaningless job rather believe it to be harmful because they consider it to be hindrance in earning livelihood and think that the people who recite it are foolish and mindless. They should …(on P. 123)
… (from P. 122) think that a useless thing is of no benefit and one who believes Allah to be Allah, the prophet as Prophet and the words of both of them to be true, cannot deny the benefit is not limited to the worldly benefit alone as it is proved with the words of the true reporter (the prophet) that ten rewards are granted with recitation of a single letter and confirmed that merely reciting the words is a great cause to be nearer to Allah and His close attention. (Islah-e-Inquilab-e-Ummat V. 1, P. 36). ... It is, therefore, the words of the Quran itself are required but impressions (print) also are required. In تلك الكتاب and قران مبين, Kitab (book) means written things and Quran means the things to be read. With the word kitab and Quran, it confirmed that impressions and words both are required. (Malfoozat V. 17, P. 220)

[2] It is thought that prayer is only for satisfaction of soul. Therefore, it has become a common belief that people are compelled to pray where the affairs are not in their control, else they believe in actions. However, for affairs in control too prayer is required, though, their occurrence is apparently based on actions and causes. If one thinks thoroughly, he will come to know that these causes coming together itself are really uncontrollable affairs and but have no other solution except praying. (Malfoozat V. 27, P. 472). In every plan, a man expresses his need either with words or action before a powerless man similar to him and in prayer, a man asks a Being Who is all powerful and everyone is in need of Him. Thus, this measure (prayer) is surely the best of all because other measures too can only succeed with the will of Allah. So, one who asks Allah Ta'ala will surely succeed. Malfoozat-V.21, P.83)

[3] The *raisons d'être*for superiority of the word (Islam) through preaching or fighting in the cause of Allah is supposed to be mere peace and freedom.

d'être having been assumed, when one finds that they are no longer required or can be attained in other ways, one summarily proceeds to declare the respective injunctions to be meaningless or futile. As soon as one's natural instincts get this much concession, one does not even care for these supposed objectives, and gives up religious practices altogether and sits idle.

As a matter of fact, we have already refuted this misconception in detail under Intimation No. 3[2], while dealing with the sixth error[3], but we had to refer to it again, for the occasion required it.

Another error that one may really commit in this regard is to seek to modify and alter the injunctions according to one's own opinion. For instance, certain people have nowadays been suggesting changes in the injunction with regard to animal sacrifice. They say that the real object behind this injunction was to make people spend in the way of God, and cattle being the wealth in those days, animal sacrifice was the proper mode of attaining this object, but money is now in general demand, and hence the mode of sacrifice should be changed.

Moreover, if one goes on like that, there would be no end to this search for *raisons d'être*. Could anyone assign a *raison d'etre* to the number of *raka'ts* in each one of the daily prayers? If human reason alone had been sufficient in these matters, there was no need for the Prophets to come, for the world has always had enough thinkers and philosophers in

---

1 Superiority of the word of Allah does not mean mere peace and freedom but as peace is commendable, similarly sometimes difference too is commendable. So, it is commendable to have difference and fight against those who agree to renounce the commandments of Allah. (Ashrafut-Tafaseer- V. 4, P. 59)

2 Intimation no 3 is "Regarding prophet-hood".

3The sixth error is: Some people invent certain *raisons d'être* for these injunctions on the basis of their personal opinion, and insist on making the validity of the injunctions depend solely on the presence or absence of these very *raisons d'être*.

every age. To tell the truth, the invention of such *raisons d'etre*, all of which really pertain to worldly good, is an implicit denial of the good of the other world. If the other world does actually exist, evidently it must be a different kind of world. It is even rationally possible that just as one geographical zone differs from another in its properties and as Mars differs from our Earth, in the same way the properties of that world may be totally unrelated to those of this world, and that we have no knowledge as to what those properties are and consequently the attainment of the good of the other world may depend on specific kinds of actions about whose correspondence and relationship to the good we can have no knowledge.

Besides that, if a man were to deal with the laws promulgated by the worldly rulers in the same way and start inventing aims and objectives for every law, and having attained those objectives through an easier method, refuse to obey the laws of the land, everyone can see for himself what would happen to such a man at the hands of the government. To take a common example, let us suppose that a man is summoned by a court of law to appear as a witness. He acknowledges the summons, but does not appear in the court on the due date on the plea that the objective of his presence is the recording of his evidence, and this objective can be attained in a simpler manner by sending his evidence in a registered letter to the judge who, fortunately, recognizes his signature. Would this man not deserve to be dealt with according to the warning contained in the summons that if he fails to present himself before the court on the due date, a warrant will be issued against him? Or to take another example, if a man changes the usual mode of greeting people, and presents to them a piece of paper with the necessary words written on it, would this new mode acceptable to them?[1]

---

[1] Why do people bow down before the rules of government? If one goes to lawyers and challenge the Indian panel codes, what reply will they give? "This is the rule", this reply suffices.

Let no one misinterpret this discussion, and conclude that, according to us, the injunctions of the *Shariah* are totally devoid of all *raisons d'être* and subtleties of this kind, or that the sages of Islam have no knowledge of such subtleties. *Raisons d'être* and subtleties are, no doubt, resent, and certain degree of illumination with regard to them has been gained in the past, and can be gained even now. All the same, the carrying out of injunctions of the *Shariah* does not at all depend on gaining such knowledge. Even if one does not possess any knowledge of the *raisons d'être,* it is absolutely necessary to obey the injunctions of the *Shariah*. It is just like the case of the legal statutes of the state if a man waits for the aims and objectives to be explained before he obeys a law, he would be committing a great crime. Even so, if the *Ulema* (Scholars) do sometimes explain such subtleties, that is a mere concession and an act of generosity on their part. Moreover, the degree of knowledge that has been gained in this respect is no more than approximative and conjectural. In fact, no knowledge has at all been gained with regard to the *raisons d'être* of certain injunctions. And it is no wonder that things should be like this. We see in our daily life that the servant in a household does not know why certain things have been arranged in a certain manner, although the master too is a creature of God like the servant. When one creature cannot know the secrets of another creature in spite of both differing in their respective degrees of knowledge within a very limited range, then what wonder if the creature should have no knowledge at all of the secrets of the Creator, or if such a knowledge should not be exact, when the difference between the knowledge of the Creator and that of the creature is immeasurable? In fact, a philosopher has even remarked that if a full rational justification for all the injunctions could be discovered, it would only serve to raise the doubt that perhaps the religion concerned had been invented by an exceptionally intelligent individuals or group of individuals, for other rational

and intelligent persons also have succeeded in fathoming the reasons for the injunctions. The peculiarity of a divinely ordained religion should be that no one can fully or perfectly get to the bottom of its subtle secrets. Nor should this discussion lead one to think that the injunctions for which we cannot find a rational justification are contrary to reason not at all. Being contrary to reason, is one thing, and one's inability to understand through reason is another (see Principle No. 1[1])

[1] The principle no. 1 is “One’s inability to understand something is no argument for its being false.”

Intimation (13)

REGARDING MUTUAL TRANSACTIONS (MU'AMALAT AND POLITICS (SIYASAAT)

It is a common error nowadays that mutual transactions and politics are not supposed to be a part of religion and of the *Shariah*. Taking them to be merely social matters, people make them dependent upon personal opinion and the exigencies of the age, and believe themselves free to act as they like in these things. It is on this ground that they are anxious to justify even usury and interest, and coax the *Ulema* to accept this opinion, and when the latter refuse to do so, they get enraged and call them the enemies of progress.

Let it be clearly understood that one should, as the first requisite, try to find out the criterion according to which a thing is included in or excluded from the *Shariah*, so that the question may be decided easily. Such a criterion is a single one namely, the promise of reward or the threat of punishment in the other world. Having discovered the final criterion, you now read the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith for your selves, and you will find many number of promises for reward and threats of punishment with regard to the matters pertaining to mutual transactions and politics.[1] Thus, the criterion having been established, could one still doubt that these things form a part of the *Shariah*? In fact, we have already dealt with the subject

---

1 For example: Different kinds of rulings have been prescribed in Surah Baqrah; some of them are about politics such as revenge, fighting, prohibition of wine, gambling and some of them are about social life such as the rulings of marriage, divorce, fosterage, bridal money, etc, and some rulings are related to mutual transactions like interest, debt, witness, and mortgage. In these rulings, we finds the words like اتقوا الله, حدود الله , سميع عليم , بصير و خبير which prove them to be clear warning on threats of punishment in case of going against them. All these commandments which are proved with sound arguments are required and obligatory in Shariah.

under Intimation No. 3[1], while discussing the fourth[2] and the fifth errors.[3]

If any doubt should still remain, it would most probably apply not to the injunctions which have been specifically laid down in the Holy Qur`an and the Hadith, but to those which have been established on the basis of an inference (*Qiyas*) by the masters of Islamic jurisprudence who enjoyed the authority to do so (*Mujtahidun*). We have already shown that they too are a part of the *Shariah*, under Intimation no.7[4], while discussing the first error[5],and have also shown, under the same Intimation while discussing the fourth error[6], that the opinion of a man who is not a *'Mujtahid'* cannot be trustworthy, and that no one does have the position of a *'Mujtahid'* nowadays. This discussion is quite sufficient to do away with all the doubts that arise with regard to the plurality of wives[7], divorce[8], interest[1], new modes of commerce like insurance etc.,

---

1 Intimation no. 3 is: "Regarding Prophet-hood".

2 The fourth error is: The teachings and injunctions of a prophet are supposed to be exclusively concerned with the affairs of the other world, while in the affairs of this world, one is supposed to be absolutely independent of such injunctions.

3 A fifth error comes out of the fourth as a corollary. That is to say, it is supposed that the injunctions of the Shariah regarding worldly affairs may be modified in accordance with the requirement of every age.

4 Regarding *Qiyas* or Inference by Analogy, as a source of the *Shariah*

5 The first error pertains to the meaning and nature of inference by Analogy.

6 The fourth error pertains to the question as to who enjoys the authority to make an Inference.

7 It is complete atheism and nonreligious to believe the plurality of wives to be unlawful and undesirable and distort the Quranic verses on this ground as today imitating the European atheists has become the cause for some Muslims for this distortion. The main act has neither the slightest doubt of undesirability in it, nor its permission in terms of validity and execution is restricted to justice, despite having the certainty of injustice, its legality and execution is certain. (Islah-e-Inquilab-e-Ummat- V.2, P. 27)

8 The glorious Quran says, "Divorce is twice; then either to retain in the recognized manner, or to release in fairness." (Surah Al-Baqarah-229)

etc., new forms of employment[2], inheritance[4], war on quarrelsome infidels, or similar problems.

---

[1]The verse which talks about the unlawfulness of devouring usury in forceful words is: “O You who believe! fear Allah and give up what still remains of usury (riba), if you are believers. But if you do not (give it up), then listen to the declaration of war from Allah and His messenger. However, if you repent, yours is your principal. Neither wrong, nor be wronged. If there is one in misery, then (the creditor should allow) deferment till (his) ease, and that you forgo it as alms is much better for you, if you really now. (Al-Masaleehul-Aqliyah 308)

[2] New forms of business and employment: During a talk, he (the author) said that he wanted to compile a book about the rulings of legality and illegality of new forms of transactions and other modes of economy emerged today and had chosen the name of that compilation as Hawadisul-Fatawa. To compile these fatawa, I had proposed that the people concerned with all types of transactions such as traders, farmers and employees should send their forms of dealings. I, therefore, expressed this requirement in my general and special talks and took promises as well, but, alas, no one helped me. Yet, I myself wrote the rulings of some new forms of transactions and some upon receiving the queries, which has been published with the name of Hawadisul-Fatawa but it is a very small compilation and does not contain many forms and is not enough for the requirements. But after studying it, at least one will come to know the rulings of all new forms coming into existence are available in the compilations of the jurisprudents, because all the rulings of new forms can be derived from the principles the jurists have set before. (Malfoozat- Al-ifazatulYaumiyyah V.10, P. 114) Abdullah bin Umar narrates that the Prophet (saw) prohibited wine and gambling. (Hadith) Now all forms of intoxicants come into the fold of wine and insurance and lottery came into gambling (which are prohibited). (Hayatul-Muslimeen- P.314)

4. Allah directs you concerning your children. For a male there is a share equal to that of two females. But, if they are (only) women, more than two, then they get two thirds of what one leaves behind. If she is one, she gets one half. As for the parents, for each of them, there is one sixth (on P. 128) (from P. 127) of what he leaves in case he has a child. But, if he has no child and his parents have inherited him, then his mother gets one third. If he has some brothers (or sisters), his mother gets one sixth, all after (settling) the will he might have made, or a debt. You do not know who, out of your fathers and your sons, is closer to you in benefiting (you). All this is determined by Allah. Surely, Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise. (Surah An-Nisa-11)

Some people are doubtful about mutual transactions and politics being essential parts of the *Shariah* or about such injunctions having been ordained for all ages to come; on the ground that one finds certain injunctions of this order to be harmful for social life in the present circumstances. So, these people suppose that either such injunctions have not been Divinely ordained or had been ordained only for the early period of Islam. We have already provided the solution to this problem under Intimation No.3[1], while discussing the fifth error[2]. Thus, there is no need for us to misinterpret the verses of the Holy Qur`an and the traditions[3] of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him), and to distort and denature the original injunctions in forced attempt to fit these injunctions to certain fanciful *raisons d'être*, as has become the custom of those who trend to be the well-wishers of Islam. If an opponent of Islam raises an objection to some Islamic injunctions, these people consider it discourteous to demand an argument which could establish the ground on which the objection is based. They rather accept the objection outright, and proceed to exclude from the *Shariah* the injunction which is being objected to, and thrust a distorted injunction of their own invention in its place, so that the following verse of the Holy Qur'an can very aptly be applied to them:

وَ اِنَّ مِنْهُمْ لَفَرِيْقًا يَّلْوٗنَ اَلْسِنَتَهُمْ بِالْكِتٰبِ لِتَحْسَبُوْهُ مِنَ الْكِتٰبِ وَ مَا هُوَ مِنَ الْكِتٰبِ ۚ وَ يَقُوْلُوْنَ هُوَ مِنْ عِنْدِ اللّٰهِ وَ مَا هُوَ مِنْ عِنْدِ اللّٰهِ ۚ وَ يَقُوْلُوْنَ عَلَى اللّٰهِ الْكَذِبَ وَ هُمْ يَعْلَمُوْنَ (القرآن)

"Among them there is indeed a group who twist their tongues while (reading) the Book, so that you may deem it to be from the Book, while it is not from the Book. They say, "It is from Allah", while it is not from Allah; and they tell lies about Allah knowingly". (3:78)

---

[1] Intimation no. 3 is "Regarding Prophet-hood".

[2] The fifth error is: "It is supposed that the injunctions of the Shariah regarding worldly affairs may be modified in accordance with the requirements of every age."

[3] Hadiths

The real root of all errors is the love of worldly life and the flattery of worldly people. To tell the truth, our modernists only seek to flatter a certain set of worldly people (namely, the westernized rulers of society), by distorting Islamic principles in the light of their postulates, and if those people were to accept these principles, their admirers would at once renounce their opinion, and would deny the very same postulates. In short, our modernists are oriented only towards the search for the approval of worldly people- they would keep turning themselves according to the will of the worldly people, as the man offering his prayers in a ship keeps changing his direction every time the ship turns.

Intimation (14)

REGARDING SOCIAL CUSTOMS (MU'ASHARAAT) AND INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES (AADAAT-E-KHASSAH)

As in the matter of mutual transactions and politics, people commit the same error here-that is to say, they do not consider social customs etc. to have any connection with religion, but make such things dependent on personal convenience and liking, or on prevalent cultural standards or on the exigencies of the day[1]. In order to see through this error, it would be sufficient to apply the criterion which we have mentioned under Intimation No.13[2].

There is, however, no doubt that in those matters with regard to which the *Shariah* has laid down neither a general nor a specific rule, one is quite free to act one likes. But in all those cases for which the *Shariah* has laid down a general or a specific regulation, there is no freedom of choice for any one.

We may mention a few examples of such specific regulations. It is prohibited to a male to wear a dress made purely of silk[3]; it is not permissible for a male to let his trousers

[1]The Shariah has touched on all our dealings and all kinds of speech and action and did not leave us free and unconstrained. There is teaching and complete law about everything. But people of social customs have excluded it from the list of Deen (faith). They think the Shariah has the rulings only about prayer, fasting, pilgrimage to Holy House, poor due, glorification and invocation of Allah, recitation of the Quran and supererogatory performances and, then, they are free to do what they wish. This is what they call freedom, today. It must be kept in our mind that we are not left free but the Shariah has dealt with our walk, talk, sitting, standing, transactions, eating and drinking, etc. and there is complete law about it in Shariah. (Malfoozat V. 4, P. 185)

[2] Intimation no. 13 is: Regarding mutual transactions and politics

3 Hazrat Huzaifah (RA) reported: The Prophet (SAW) prohibited us from eating or drinking in gold or silver utensils and from wearing (on P. 134)

go beneath the ankles[1] or to shave off his beard[2]; it is prohibited to make or keep the picture of a living being[3],to keep a dog without there being any need for it is a sin[4],it is not permissible to eat the meat of animal which has not been slaughtered in the prescribed way according to the *Shariah*[5];it is not permissible to take alcohol or spirits either as a drink or as medicine, nor to use it externally or internally[6].

Now, one or two examples of general regulations: It is not permissible for a Muslim to simulate the infidels either in dress or in modes of food and drink, etc[7]. It is forbidden to collect subscriptions through some clever trick or when not given willingly[8]. It is necessary to avoid that particular kind of

---

…(from P. 133) silk and brocade, or sitting on (anything made from) them.(Al-Bukhari B. 4, H. No. 809).

1 Abu Hurairah (RA) reported: The messenger of Allah said, "On the Day of Resurrection, Allah will not look at him who trails his lower garment out of pride." (Bukhari B.4, H. 792)

[2] It was narrated from Ibn 'Umar that: The Prophet (saw) said: "Trim the moustache and let the beard grow." (Sunan an-Nasa'i 5226)

3 Narrated Hazrat Aisha (RA): The Prophet (saw) entered upon me while there was a curtain having pictures (of animals) in the house. His face got red with anger, and then he got hold of the curtain and tore it into pieces. The Prophet (saw) said, "Such people as paint these pictures will receive the severest punishment on the Day of Resurrection." (Bukhari-6109)

4 Abu Talhah (RA) said: The Messenger of Allah said, "The angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog or a portrait." (Bukhari- B.18 H. 1684)

[5]Hazrat Abdullah ibn-e-Abbas narrated: The Jews came to the Prophet (saw) and said: We eat which we kill but we do not eat which Allah kills? So Allah revealed: "Eat not of (meats) on which Allah's name hath not been pronounced." to the end of the verse. (Abu Dawood-2819)

6HazratIbn 'Umar reported Allah's Messenger (saw) as saying: Every intoxicant is Khamr (wine) and every intoxicant is forbidden. He who drinks wine in this world and dies while he is addicted to it, not having repented, will not be given a drink in the Hereafter. (Muslim-2003)

7Hazrat Abdullah ibn Umar (RA) narrated: The Prophet (saw) said: He who copies any people is one of them. (Abu-Dawood-4031)

[8]HazratAmr bin Yathribi narrated: the Prophet (saw) said: Wealth of a Muslim man is not allowed except with his own will. (Baihaqi-11325)

carriage or dress which is intended to show off one's power or wealth or position[1], etc.

In all such matters no one is free to choose or act as one likes. Nowadays, individual freedom has become a special cult[2], and it is usually employed in such matters. If anyone tries tries to correct the followers of this cult, they invent all sorts of tricks to defend themselves. Sometimes they demand a "proof" from the Holy Qur'an to justify these injunctions[3]; sometimes they raise doubts with regard to the Traditions[4] of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him)[5]; sometime they ascribe fanciful *raison* d'être to these regulations, and on this basis proceed to modify or distort them[6]; sometimes they ask for a rational justification[7], and sometimes provide gratuitous explanation for for such practices[8]; and sometimes they are insolent enough to make fun of these injunctions.

---

1 It is narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (may peace and blessings be upon him) observed: The belief is among the Yemenites, and the unbelief is towards the East, and tranquillity is among those who rear goats and sheep, and pride and simulation is among the uncivil and rude owners of horses and camels. (Muslim- B.1, H. 88)

[2]Most of the people believe that social customs are based on the need of one's temperament whereas such belief is wrong. The lawgiver (Prophet) did not leave anything. He explained everything; and all these are preserved in the form of the Quran and the Hadith. (Malfoozat- v.12, P.30)

[3] It has been answered in the first error under intimation no. 4.

[4]Hadiths

[5] The answer has been given under intimation no. 5, regarding Hadith as one of the sources of the Shariah.

[6] For example: It is said why the prophet forbade to domesticate dog despite the fact that it has so and so qualities. (Malfoozat-V.6, P. 233)

[7] It is, therefore, said that (1) Human beings are forbidden to eat some objects, then, why and what purpose Allah Ta'ala created them for? (2) Having absorbed in flesh, the blood of non-slaughtered animal becomes flesh too, then, why it is forbidden.

[8] For instance: Prohibition of taking photograph was only because it caused idolatry. Since, today is an advanced and civilized age, such possibility has no place. (Malfoozat- V. 6, P. 233)

We have already refuted all such objections in the foregoing Intimations. The fact of the matter is that the individual opinion of any person has no value as against the legal regulations of the *Shariah*, nor is it permissible to investigate into their aims and objectives. If a *raison d'être* or subtlety is now and then given out in order to make things simpler to understand, it is not a complete explanation, but only a concession. But the mind and taste of our contemporaries has become so distorted that such statements are supposed to be very valuable. So, by way of a concession, we too may make a little remark on the subject of imitating the infidels in dress etc. If someone appears before others dressed in the clothes of his wife, would it not look odd on the very same basis of imitation? Do the so-called “civilised” rulers, who make everything dependent upon reason, not compel those who appear in a court of law to obey certain legal regulations with regard to dress? If someone were to transgress them, would it not be considered as contempt of court? This being so, can the *Shariah* not have the right to interfere with personal lives even to this extent?

Intimation (15)

REGARDING MORAL ATTITUDES AND AFFECTIONS OF THE HUMAN MIND

As in the case of mutual transactions, politics or social customs, the same error is committed in this matter too that is to say, it is not supposed to come within the purview of religion. And the argument which shows the falsity of this opinion is again the same as has been advanced in the case of mutual transactions etc. That is, the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith give out the promise of reward and threat of punishment with regard to specified moral attitudes.

A special error that is usually committed in this matter is that certain virtues have been falsely mixed up with certain vices, and vice versa, and a proper demarcation has not been made between the two categories. Consequently certain moral attitudes which are reprehensible in their essential nature, have been given fine names, and thus considered to be commendable, while others have been dealt with in the opposite manner. Let us cite a few instances of the first kind. What is nowadays regarded as "progress" is in its essential nature, the greed for money and social position; what is called "honour" is in fact pride; the quality known as "love for one's nation" is basically the spirit of tribalism which blinds one to the distinction between right and wrong; what is called "statesmanship" is in fact deceit and cunning; what is known as "keeping up with the march of time" is in reality mere hypocrisy; so on and so forth[1].

---

[1]Abu Sa'id Al-Khudri (RA) reported: Someone asked Messenger of Allah: "Who is the best man?" He answered, "A believer who strives in the Cause of Allah with his life and his wealth." The man asked: "Who is the next?" He said, "One who retires into a narrow valley and worships his Rubb (Lord). Another narration is: Messenger of Allah said, ... (on Page 138)

Now, as for the instances of the second kind, that is of those moral attitudes which are commendable but are nowadays being included among the reprehensible ones (vices): contentment which is supposed to be the lack of initiative; acceptance of and resignation to the Will of God, which is condemned as idleness; zealous regard for religion and firmness of faith, which is called dogmatism and fanaticism; indifference to one's physical appearance, which is described as debasing oneself; courtesy, which is supposed to be meanness and pettiness of mind; fear of God and piety, which is considered to be mere whimsicality; keeping oneself away from unnecessarily mixing with people, which is called misanthropy; so on and so forth.

In certain cases, they have not given new names to vices, but do practice them, taking them to be virtues, to give a few instances; false imputation of motives to other; injustice to and negligence of the rights of the poor; callous attitude towards the needy, humiliating others, lack of respect for others; slandering others, picking faults in them, and specially maligning the *Ulema* and pious people; exhibitionism, vanity an hypocrisy; squandering money; indifference to the concerns of the other world; etc., etc.

If one wishes to learn more on the subject of moral attitudes, one should consult the books on ethics, particularly the works of *Imam Ghazzali* which are incomparable in this respect.

(from P. 137) "One who fears Allah and safeguards people against his own mischief."" (Agreed Upon)

Intimation (16)

REGARDING RATIONAL ARGUMENTATION

Nowadays people talk too often and too much about rational argumentation, but when they actually employ this method, they commit a number of errors.

Firstly, they give absolute precedence to a rational argument over an argument based on sound report. We have already laid down the rule with regard to this situation under Principle No. 7[1].

Secondly, they take a conjecture or an induction for a rational argument.

Thirdly, they try to explain the subsidiary injunctions of the *Shariah* on a rational basis.

Fourthly, considering a precedent to be a final proof, they sometimes rely on it completely while advancing a proposition, and sometimes demand a precedent from their opponent in a discussion, even though he has established his own case on the basis of an argument.

Fifthly, they demand a rational argument for things which are rationally possible. We have already shown the falsity of the last two things under Principles No. 5[2] and 6[3].

Sixthly, if a thing is improbable, they suppose that it is for the very same reason impossible.

Seventhly, they consider the habitual and the rational to be one and the same thing. So on and so forth.

---

[1] Principle 7 is: "Only four situations are rationally possible in which there can be a contradiction between a rational argument and argument based on report." (page 28)

[2] Principle 5 is: "It is not possible to prove a purely reported fact by a purely rational argument. So it is not also permissible to demand such an argument."

[3] Principle 6 is: "There is some difference between a precedent and an argument. It may be justifiable to demand an argument from the man who makes an assertion, but it is not valid to demand a precedent from him."

CONCLUSION

Having dealt with these doubts and objections, we think that they are sufficient for the moment. If the Almighty Allah helps us or someone else to continue the work on this subject as we have explained in the introduction, more additions can be made to the present book later on. The present book is, so to say, the first volume, and the future additions will make up the later volumes.

وأفوض أمري إلى الله إن الله بصير بالعباد. وصلى الله على خير خلقه محمد وآله و أصحابه الأمجاد، إلى يوم التناد.

21, Rajab, 1330 A.H.
Thana Bhawan

صانها الله تعالى عن الفتن

List of Incorrect Words in English Book, Printed in 1976 from Darul Uloom Karachi, Pakistan

SN	Correct Word	Incorrect Word	Page No.	Para. No.	Line No.
1	notices	notice	1	1	1
2	Of	off	12	2	10
3	So	no	18	2	6
4	Besides	beside	19/20/62/63 /99	1/3/2/3/ 1	13/2/1/ 12/1
5	Respects	respect	28	1	2
6	to turn it away	to turn is away	28	3	13
7	consonance	consonnance	29	3	7
8	possibly	possible	30	3	2
9	un-reflectingly	un-flectingly	31	2	1
10	Lies	lese	34	1	9
11	has observed	has never observed	36	2	6
12	into two ways	into ways	38	1	8
13	Seen	see	38	2	4
14	Nature	natural	38	2	8
15	that it should	that is should	39	3	5
16	and include	not and include	40	3	6
17	Began	being	41	3	14
18	this being so ………. cause	repetition (this being so …… cause)	45	1	11-13
19	to be	to	45	2	7

	considered	considered			
20	World	word	46	3	3
21	rulers	ruler	47	2	9
22	as the	as he	50	2	12
23	is made	is make	53	2	5
24	who is required to	repetition (who is required to)	54	3	9
25	defendant	dependent	55	1	2/4
26	well-established	will-established	55	2	1
27	Code	come	56	2	6
28	Rests	reset	56	2	10
29	attempt to make	attempt make	56	3	2
30	upon scientific	repetition (upon scientific)	60	2	3
31	Sect	set	61	1	18
32	the names	them names	62	1	9
33	Reason	season	62	1	15
34	not be proper	not proper	63	2	1
35	May	man	64	2	6
36	Thorough	through	66	1	5
37	to understand	to understanding	71	1	3
38	conforms	on forms	72	2	14
39	Dawn	down	73	2	5
40	analogous	analogons	76	2	6
41	Very	bery	77	4	9
42	Tend	ten	78	2	13
43	once they	once the they	79	2	1
44	That is why ……….	repetition of the sentence	80-81	3	6

	manner.				
45	Even	when	81	3	5
46	It	id	84	2	5
47	that first man is born out of clay	that man is born out of human seed	86	2	3/4
48	Those	these	87	1	15
49	etc. are	etc. Are (A capital)	88	2	11
50	Flag	flog	95	2	12
51	one does not even	one does to even	97	1	21
52	Idle	ideal	97	1	23
53	Fact	act	98	1	1
54	modify and alter	modify and after	98	2	2
55	have no knowledge	have knowledge	98	3	16
56	Even	when	99	2	8
57	Promises	premises	101	2	8
58	all errors	all error	103	2	1
59	beard	bread	104	3	4

ESTABLISHMENT AND NEED OF INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF QASMI THOUGHT

Need to Protect Islamic Thought:

The most important issue of Muslim Ummah is to safeguard Islamic belief and thought. This will be clear crystal if we thoroughly study the pages of the history. Moreover, it is the matter of great surprise that in the name of "fiqh Academy" many institutions have come into existence but there is no worth-mentioning institute titled with Islamic Thought that is free from rigidity, immoderation and exceeding of proper bounds and has a truly Islamic moderation. Therefore, it is essential to establish an institute for protection and understanding of cohesive Islamic thought. The first and foremost thing that Allah Almighty has drawn attention to is the protection of faith and thought.

Vision: To introduce the true Islamic thought and belief to every Muslim and giving every human being his right

The consequence of separating religion from social life:

It is fact that the Islamic world in particular and the whole world in general are facing the most difficult issues nowadays. The main reason for this is that the politics, education and society have been separated from each other by the West, and the religion has been made as a personal matter of an individual. The purpose of its establishment is to spread the spirit of sheltering not only the Islamic world, but the whole of mankind into the cradle of peace. So that the hatred is eradicated from the society and love is promoted. And once the thoughts are corrected there would be an effort to use modern resources in general interest of the human beings. Those who have created havoc by making these things as a means of gaining their own interests, the reality of such institutions,

sectors and resolutions should be exposed to the public and efforts should be made to create a purely human and Islamic and peaceful environment.

The need to put human thought on the right track:

Who is responsible for the world's horrible conditions at the moment? Why did such a situation arise? Who paved the way for such a situation? How was human thought plunged into such a deep well of misguidance? What resources were used for this? And what are the motives behind it? These are all burning questions that may not come in every common man's mind. Because the spoilers have used such a cunning tricks that human mind is easily not attracted to them.

International Academy of Qasmi Thought:

The purpose of establishing International Academy of Qasmi Thought is to look for the answers and solutions to such necessary questions and problems in the light of facts. Until the answers to these questions are brought to the world in the light of the facts, the world will continue to deteriorate. Because the root cause of all evils is the intellectual immorality. Today's man is getting involved in unnecessary debates and becoming oblivious to the real issues of the life. Unless a disease is properly diagnosed, it cannot be cured.

Objectives:

1. To revive Islamic thought with the same strength as the West tried to root out the Islamic beliefs.
2. To choose the right and effective way to protect the new generation from intellectual deviations.
3. To produce authentic books, documentaries and pamphlets on the subject of true Islamic thought effectively through education and media.

4. Taking a realistic look at the education system and curriculum of the contemporary Islamic world and other countries, analyzing its factual basis and highlighting its negative aspects in front of Muslims to avoid it.
5. To develop Islamic thought in a scientific and modern style, free from all sorts of violence, extremism and tolerance and innovation, in the light of the Qur'an and Sunnah in accordance with the interpretation of the Salaf-e-Saliheen (pious forefathers).
6. Develop a curriculum that takes into account the Islamic ideology (correct Islamic thought about the life of the universe and man).
7. To unite scholars and thinkers from all over the world on one platform.
8. To expose conspiracies hatched by the enemies of Islam to distort Islamic thought and belief.
9. To compile such scientific and intellectual materials on intellectual topics, to inform the students of Islamic schools and Islamic universities. It would attract them to promote the right faith and thought among Muslim Ummah.
10. To identify the intellectual and reforming errors in textbooks of government and non-government school curricula and to conduct workshops among school and college teachers to inform them of errors and misleading materials. Instead, how can students become familiar with the correct Islamic thought and attitude?

Today in the world, big conferences are held on the topics of eradication of terrorism, protection of human rights, abrogation of extremism, but the strange thing is that these major conferences discuss religious violence and religious extremism, etc., but either of them do not discuss on the rigidity in the atheistic thought! While the root cause of the current situation is the prevalence of atheistic ideologies.

The study of history makes it clear that whenever religious thought is prevalent in society with its original shape, an atmosphere of peace and tranquillity prevails, and when the religious thought deteriorates and weakens, the situation worsens. Today the world is being taught the contrary lesson that Islamic extremism or religious ideology is responsible for what is happening, although the real responsible is atheistic idea or scheme.

The Muslim Ummah in particular and c are to be assured that until the correct Islamic thought prevails and atheistic thoughts are banned, these adversities that have befallen the world cannot be averted. Therefore, Muslims must understand that when thought and belief are correct, peace and order will prevail in the society. Therefore, it is necessary to present some Islamic countries as an example in this regard so that the followers of other religions too, understand that atheistic thought is in fact the root cause of all evils.

The evil consequences of separating Deen from social life:

The Islamic world in particular but the whole world is facing multifaceted issues. The root cause of this problem is the west has separated politics, education, social life and economy, in fact all realms of life from each other. Specially, separating religion from the collective issue, the west has made it an individual issue of man. The aim and objectives of establishing this institute is to propagate the spirit of protecting not only the Islamic world but the whole mankind into the cradle of peace and security, in order to eliminate hatred, animosity and vindictiveness and love and affection is spread in human society. After the thought is reformed, new sources and means could be used for the common interest of the people. Those who are creating havoc for gaining their vested interest, the truth of such organizations, institutes and resolutions must be revealed with possible available sources and sincere efforts

should be made to establish pure human and Islamic peaceful atmosphere.

These thoughts and views were striking my mind for a long time. After much consideration, I have put them on pages. With this regard, your suggestions, feedback and key guidelines are highly required. It is hoped the true guidance would be recommended.

Note: it is our endeavour to put these thoughts into practice rather than formulating agenda.

Sincere prayers are needed for us to work honestly to exalt the words of Allah.

Huzaifa Vastanvi
Huzaifa.vastanwi@gmail.com